BUILDERS OF THE CANADIAN COMMONWEALTH



BY GEORGE H. LOCKE


Sir Wilfrid Laurier
George Brown
D'Arcy Mc Gee
C.W. Jefferys


Sir John
A. Macdonald
Joseph Howe
NOS LOIS
ET NOS
LANGUE
Louis J.
Papineau

BUILDERS OF THE CANADIAN COMMONWEALTH

BUILDERS OF THE CANADIAN COMMONWEALTH

BY GEORGE H. LOCKE

With an Introduction by A.H.U. Colquhoun



The RYERSON PRESS : TORONTO

Copyright, Canada, 1923, by
THE RYERSON PRESS

CONTENTS

I. Louis Joseph Papineau..... 1
The Representative System.

II. William Lyon Mackenzie 13
The Responsibilities of Electors.

III. Hon. Robert Baldwin..... 27
Responsible Government.

IV. Sir Louis H. LaFontaine..... 41
French Canada and Responsible Government.

V. Hon. Thomas Chandler Haliburton 49
Imperial Federation.

VI. Sir Oliver Mowat..... 61
The Failure of Legislative Union.

VII. Sir John A. Macdonald..... 73
The Advantages of Confederation.

VIII. Hon. George Brown... 83
The Union of the British North American Colonies.

IX. Hon. Thomas D'Arcy McGee..... 95
The Principle of Federation.

X. SIR CHARLES TUPPER..... 105
The Necessity for Union—A Plea for Nationality.

XI. SIR GEORGES ETIENNE CARTIER..... 115
The Union of the Provinces.

XII. SIR RICHARD JOHN CARTWRIGHT..... 125
A Coalition Government in the Face of an Emergency.

XIII. SIR ANTOINE AIME DORION..... 137
The Weakness of the Confederation Scheme.

XIV. HON. JOSEPH HOWE..... 151
Commercial Relations between Canada and the United States.

XV. SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD..... 161
The Relationship of Canada to Great Britain.

XVI. HON. EDWARD BLAKE..... 167
Canada's Relation to the Empire.

XVII. SIR WILFRID LAURIER..... 179
Political Liberalism.

XVIII. PRINCIPAL GEORGE M. GRANT..... 189
Canada First.

XIX. SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD..... 199
Canada's Relationship to Great Britain and the United States.

XX. SIR WILFRID LAURIER..... 203
Death of Sir John A. Macdonald.

XXI.	Sir George W. Ross..... *The Evolution of Canadian Sentiment.*	211
XXII.	Professor Stephen Leacock..... *Education and Empire Unity.*	221
XXIII.	Rev. James A. Macdonald..... *International Relations.*	229
XXIV.	Sir George E. Foster..... *The Call of Canada.*	237
XXV.	Sir Wilfrid Laurier..... *When Great Britain is at War We are at War.*	245
XXVI.	Sir George E. Foster..... *Canada and the War.*	251
XXVII.	Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux..... *The Quebec Act.*	255
XXVIII.	Sir Robert A. Falconer..... *The Meaning of the West.*	265
XXIX.	Sir Lomer Gouin..... *Quebec and Confederation.*	275
XXX.	Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King. *Liberalism and Reconstruction.*	285
XXXI.	Hon. Arthur S. Meighen..... *The Glorious Dead.*	295
XXXII.	Sir Robert Laird Borden..... *From Confederation to the World War*	301
XXXIII.	Hon. Newton W. Rowell..... *Canada's Place in the Empire.*	309

INTRODUCTION

IN any collection of the speeches of Canadian public men the political element would predominate. This does not mean that the men themselves lacked the literary equipment or that they were without views upon literature, art, or the criticism of life. The contrary is the case. The general culture of those from whose addresses extracts are given in this volume was not inferior. But the speeches that have been preserved are naturally those dealing with the great episodes in our constitutional development. Such subjects inspired the deepest emotions and the most striking thoughts. If one were able to find the utterances of the same speakers on other themes a wider presentation of their intellectual qualities and tastes could be made. But the purpose is, primarily, to relate present problems of national life back to some of the men who helped to mould history and to include some of those still living who have, incidentally or chiefly, laboured to the same end. Having this object in view Dr. Locke has performed a difficult task with impartial judgment, while the industry required to do it—as one who has worked a little in the same vineyard can testify—must have received its impetus from nothing less than an abiding love of Canada. The Canadian has, in some degree, the

cosmopolitan mind. Notable speeches by British or foreign statesmen dwell as vividly in his memory as some delivered by his own countrymen and the former are usually more accessible.

To read the following pages is to gain some idea of the mental powers, the earnest sincerity and the eloquence of those Canadian leaders whose voices we shall hear no more. To hear and to read are two vastly different things. As the great French critic declared, there is as much eloquence in the tone of the voice, in the eyes, and in the air of a speaker as in his choice of words. Something of this is supplied by the brief appreciation that the editor has prefixed to each speech, written with a sympathy and a kindliness that are as valuable as the insight and knowledge displayed. But even so, the reader must supply for himself, by the exercise of his imagination, the quality that made these speeches tell—the flashing eye, the thrilling tone, the gesture (and some were prodigal of gesture). The events that inspired the speech must also be understood. The reader should not expect to find this volume a royal road to complete knowledge of the subject, but will feel himself compelled, if he is a Canadian of the right kind, to make excursions farther afield into history, into the fascinating by-paths of biography and into the principles of political progress that make Canada—in its own place and within its limits,—so interesting and profitable an area for research because the solution of our problems, and the ways by which we came to solve them, may constitute Canada's most useful legacy to posterity.

The Canadian statesmen of former periods filled a great space in the popular mind. They gave, for the most part, the whole of their lives to public affairs. Either in Parliament, or outside of it, they represented causes. Their speeches were usually addressed to the people at large. There are persons still living who remember well some of these orators at the zenith of their influence and power—Joseph Howe, Sir John Macdonald, George Brown, Principal Grant, Edward Blake, Sir Antoine Dorion. It seems but yesterday since Cartwright, Mowat, Ross, and Laurier left the scene of so many triumphs. Who can forget who has heard the sonorous accents of Blake, as he stood, an impressive and dignified figure on the platform swaying an audience as Antony is pictured as moving the Roman crowds after the death of Cæsar? Who was willing to miss a single word of Cartwright's scornful indictment of the foe, as he poured forth in perfectly-constructed sentences and from a richly-dowered vocabulary, his denunciations of men and measures alike unworthy, in his view, of respect and confidence? The charm of Sir John Macdonald's speeches lay not in oratorical declamation, but in the easy and simple grasp of the dullest questions which he exhibited, enlivened by a droll humour that made an old story seem new because its application was so apt and appropriate. At such a function as a St. Andrew's Society dinner, where politics were rigidly debarred, Macdonald the man was, perhaps, seen at his best, for his affectionate raillery at those of his own racial origin, and the stories at his own expense which he enjoyed as much

as his audience, give a more certain clue to his power over the masses of his fellow-countrymen than the more weighty deliverances on the Washington Treaty or the Letellier constitutional dispute, in which no trace of humour was permitted to creep in, but which were the true index of his intellectual capacity. In reading these speeches, we should, therefore, keep before us, if we can, the personality behind each of them, because the career, the manner, and the point of view are inseparable from the particular utterance.

A word may be said, in conclusion, as to the admirable purpose which a work like the present fulfills. Even in large libraries all the sources from which the material must have been drawn cannot be consulted. The editions of Canadian books are not large and are thus soon exhausted. While Canadian biography figures creditably in the national literature few biographies include the speeches which must be sought elsewhere. With the exception of the modern edition of Howe, to whose editor a debt of gratitude is due, biographers have, naturally enough, been unable to include the speeches. There are the parliamentary debates, but these, too, are not readily obtainable. Strange as it may sound, Dr. Locke has gathered together much information and enlightenment not actually accessible to the average Canadian, and for whom in most cases it is a locked door of knowledge. It may confidently be hoped that a work that should stimulate a healthy interest inthe national history will be found to produce, in time, far-reaching effects in study and in comprehension of the past.

A. H. U. COLQUHOUN

PREFACE

IN the definitely educational aspect of our work in the Public Library we have felt the need of a history of our country as revealed in the speeches of her public men where they are discussing the contemporary problems of national life with which they were confronted. History in the process of making with all the ardour of advocacy or the fervour of denunciation has a personal interest which is almost impossible to arouse by a calm logical treatment in the light of after years. The individual becomes less and less and the facts more and more, which may be suitable for historians but well nigh useless in training for citizenship and developing intelligent patriotism in the youth of our land. The struggle for responsible government, for representation by population or for the confederation of the provinces was carried on by men, and it is worth while to know who they were and what they actually said "in the fell clutch of circumstance."

GEORGE H. LOCKE

The Public Library
Toronto

LOUIS JOSEPH PAPINEAU

LOUIS JOSEPH PAPINEAU

1786-1871

THE name of Papineau is one to conjure with in French Canada. The personality, genius and patriotism of this outstanding Canadian have stamped themselves ineffaceably on the hearts of his romantic countrymen. Canadians of English descent, more responsive to the prose than to the poetry of life, may be inclined to remember the least attractive side of Papineau's history, but the most ardent lover of British institutions cannot fail to appreciate the single-minded devotion of this well-meaning, though mistaken patriot, to the land of his birth.

Louis Papineau was born in Quebec, in 1786, at a period of great political turmoil. His father, Joseph Papineau, was himself a politician of no mean repute, and it was natural that at an early age the brilliant young Louis should turn his attention to the welfare of his countrymen in their struggle for political self-expression. While attending the Quebec Seminary, his intellectual brilliance and his marvellous oratorical powers pointed to a great future, and his passionate enthusiasm, coupled with fearlessness, determination and a love of freedom, seemed to supply all the requisites for a Superman.

But one great thing was lacking in his composition, the absence of which made a tragedy of the great

orator's life: he was entirely without self-restraint, and, entering the political arena at a time when patience and moderation were sorely needed, the outcome was inevitable.

In 1812 Papineau entered the Lower Canadian Assembly, and from the beginning enlisted his sympathies and his magnificent gifts in the struggle of the Assembly against the corruptions and injustices which were rife in the Legislative and Executive Councils, dominated by a narrow, place-seeking English oligarchy. In 1815 he was elected Speaker of the House, and from this date until the fateful days of 1837, he held first place in the hearts of his countrymen, swaying his imaginative disciples, both in and out of the Assembly, with his burning eloquence and his magnetic personality.

In 1822 he was sent as a delegate to London with a petition from his people against a proposed union with Upper Canada, which threatened to undermine the French nationality in Canada. The mission was successful, and his great charm and dignity impressed London society very favourably. He returned to Canada to renew his fight against the tyranny of the English faction in Parliament, and was the leader in the battle over the finances which animated Lower Canadian politics for fifteen years.

By 1827 the situation was critical indeed, and Governor Dalhousie, fearing Papineau's mighty influence, refused to sanction his re-election to the speakership. This action resulted in a petition to London by Papineau's idolizers, asking for the Governor-General's recall. The petition was granted,

but matters were not improved. A change of policy, not of governors, was what was needed, and when Papineau became convinced of the stolid indifference of the British Government to the wrongs of French Canada, he became embittered, and from 1830 onward he was as violent an agitator against British institutions as he had earlier been an admirer of them.

His radical utterances in the Assembly soon lost him the support of his more moderate countrymen, and jealousy helped to increase the volume of vindictive sarcasm and rage which he poured forth daily in the Assembly—stubbornly refusing all compromises which the British Government offered him, and, by his rashness, rendering inevitable the foolish uprising which has gone down into history as the "Rebellion of 1837 in Lower Canada."

During the rebellion, Papineau escaped to the United States, and though in 1842 his former disciple, LaFontaine, secured a pardon for him, he deemed it inadvisable to return to Canada just then, and spent three years in France, where he devoted himself to historical research, and where, unfortunately, his impressionable mind was influenced by ultra-Radicals, such as Louis Blanc. When he returned to Canada in 1847 he again entered politics, and constituted himself a bitter minority against the moderate Liberals who had agreed to the Union of the Provinces. For some years he continued to raise his voice against British institutions, and in favor of a French-Canadian democracy, fashioned on American lines; but, although his great eloquence and commanding personality were still influential with the

younger section of his people, his efforts were, on the whole, futile, and he retired to private life in 1854.

In 1867 he was lured out of his domestic retreat for a moment to give a lecture at the Canadian Institute, where he gave a lucid summary of British rule in Canada, and re-affirmed his distrust of English institutions—but after this final challenge he went back to the felicity of home life, where he remained until his death in 1871.

Such were the high spots in the life of this misguided patriot, whose gravest faults sprang from the intensity of his patriotism. In spite of his excesses, the stimulus he gave to Canadian political development was considerable, and though to-day unbiassed Canadians deplore his mistakes, they must feel the tenderest admiration for a man who, out of the fulness of his heart, uttered, in his last public speech, words which should kindle the pulses of all loyal Canadians:

"I love my country—I have loved her wisely!—I have loved her madly! 'My country first!' I learned to lisp at my father's knee."

THE REPRESENTATIVE SYSTEM

Louis Joseph Papineau

* *From a speech on the hustings at the opening of the election for the west ward of Montreal, August 11, 1827.*

YOU are assembled to exercise an important right, that of choosing freely, with the sole view to your own interests, men whom you think most capable of upholding them; to exercise a right which for several centuries (until quite recent times, in fact) was enjoyed exclusively by British subjects:—the privilege of choosing Representatives to act as legislators. The men of your choice, cannot, it is true, be called legislators in a strict and absolute sense, because they share this power with other authorities, who, in this country especially, could never become the objects of your choice; but, as those authorities, in their turn, cannot alter the laws nor create new ones without the assent of your Representatives, these latter may, in a restricted sense, be called your legislators.

Nothing has received greater emphasis in our public and constitutional law than the maxim that governments are constituted only with a view to the common weal, and not principally for the advantage of the public functionaries. The truth of this maxim has been conceded even by despotic governments, which raise themselves above the laws; but in our present situation in this province it is only an illusion, a dead letter, a cheat, and is productive of no real advantage. Our government professes to be immeasurably superior to a despotism, but of what use are the frequent relations with the people of which the administrators of our government boast, if instead of ascertaining

the wishes of the people with the intention of fulfilling them, they use the Representative system merely as a blind, and having learned the tenour of public opinion ignore it, and govern in their own selfish interests?

In our government these frequent relations with the mass of the people take place periodically by means of elections, daily by means of petitions, annually through the mediation of the Representatives, who are an integral part of the government, and at the same time, an organ and a voice for the people. Their decisions ought to be adopted, except in singular cases where it is evident that they are counter to the wishes of the majority of their constituents. The nearer the other authorities,—the Legislative and Executive Councils—come to the views and the desires of the representative body in our constitutional government, so much the more exactly do they move in conformity with the laws of their nature and so much the more accurately do they correspond to the end, and approach the scope, of their institution. On the other hand, in proportion as they are indifferent or opposed to the wishes of a representative body true to its constituents, the more do they swerve from the purposes of their institution. In their abnormal course they threaten the political world with afflictions and disorders more real than those which our fathers feared in the physical world on the appearance of planets with whose devious courses they were unacquainted. History demonstrates that in England kings have been adjudged good or bad according to the degree of concord which prevailed between them

and the people's Representatives. If discord reigned the fault was attributed to tyrannical or incapable Princes, who desired to raise themselves above the laws.

If the House of Commons in England could receive the laws from its Kings, if it could be reprimanded by them with arrogance, it would never have become the admiration and study of other nations, and the model which they endeavoured to copy. The Representative system is becoming the desire of all civilized nations, because it promises to them a powerful lever to extirpate abuses; because it affords a popular efficacious action which penetrates into all the parts of administration, and influences, in a salutary manner, all its agents, from the Sovereign to the lowest officer, reminding them of their mission, which is to secure the peace and prosperity of nations. It seems as if republicanism and absolute monarchy will exist for them, at no distant period, only in the pages of past history, that the human race will be divided into two great classes: freemen, who will have representatives, and slaves who will have none, or whose representatives, instead of being counsellors of an executive power which ought to receive their advice with deference, will be vice-regents of a degraded people, who would allow their representatives to be insulted with impunity by men, who (supposedly) are paid only on condition that they shall consult and procure the public welfare.

* * * * * *

You see at present in Lower Canada, Legislative and Executive Councillors treating the electors with

an exaggerated and hitherto-unpractised courtesy, venting an extreme rudeness of old standing against the Representatives, very busy, running about, agitating, strutting, stirring and torturing both themselves and yourselves, in order to decide your choice according to their wishes. Those gentlemen are familiar with only the smallest portion of the English constitution, and that portion the least applicable to the state of this country. They adopt that part which relates to the splendour and privileges of Royalty and Aristocracy, though our Sovereign and his nobles are little inclined to settle amongst us; but ignore the enactments upholding the privileges of the nation, although there is a people settled on these lands which sees a great deal less of real distance grounded on reason between the administrators and themselves, than exists in England between the administrators of the government and the people. Well, in England, the House of Commons having declared that the interference of the Lords in election is contrary to principle, the people are so tenacious of their rights, and so careful of their Representatives, that they would resent the intrusion of a lord who took an active and open part in the election. Here, in Lower Canada, the example set by our great personages has been followed by a retinue of great and little, high and low officers whom they draw after them and keep in chains.

This proposition I advance, and no man who has studied the situation will deny it, namely, that in no other part of the British Empire is it so essential as in this province, to find great independence and

energy in the Representative body, because in that body alone can be found a counterpoise to the excesses of power concentrated in a small number of persons having for the most part no link of permanent interests with the country. When the same persons unite the legislative, executive, and judiciary powers in themselves, the abuses which they shall have committed in one of these capacities they are endowed with sufficient means to uphold in the other; and from abuses to abuses the laws would soon be powerless, unless there was an unceasing and fearless watch over them on the part of your Representatives.

WILLIAM LYON MACKENZIE

WILLIAM LYON MACKENZIE

1795-1861

THE moderate Canadian in full enjoyment of the privileges of self-government is inclined to minimize the debt which he owes to the great Canadian rebel, William Lyon Mackenzie, and to magnify his indiscretions. But a careful examination of all the circumstances connected with his career, will reveal the magnitude of his service to Canadian constitutional development, and will soften the memory of his faults.

Gifted with a keen intellect, an indomitable will, high personal courage, and an extraordinary reserve of energy, Mackenzie was destined to play an important part in the life of a young colony, which stood in urgent need of strong men, and from his arrival in Canada in 1820, until his death forty-one years later, his history is interwoven with the development of the province.

When Mackenzie left Scotland to make his fortune in Canada, the "Family Compact" of Upper Canada was at its zenith. The corruption and favouritism which held sway under this narrow oligarchy paralyzed the efforts of would-be reformers, and to Mackenzie with his constitutional hatred of tyranny

and injustice this was intolerable. He had come to Canada for purely business reasons, but indignation at the behaviour of the Compact, and sympathy for the struggling party of Reform drew him into the crux of the situation and kept him there for the remainder of his life.

In 1824 he established the 'Colonial Advocate' to espouse the cause of self-government, and to protest against the attitude of the existing government. For ten years he continued its publication in the teeth of violent opposition and at a financial loss, uniting the scattered ranks of Reformers, and crystallizing the principles of Reform.

At first his statements were moderate in the extreme for in spite of his defect of temper he honestly strove to preserve a calm and judicial attitude in his criticism. But the repeated acts of violence, and the bitter rejoinders of his adversaries, drove him to an intemperance of speech which widened the breach between the opposing parties and made reconciliation impossible.

In 1828 he entered the Legislative Assembly, determined to break the back of the Family Compact. In the Assembly he continued the spirited criticism of the Government which he was conducting simultaneously in his journal, and infuriated his political foes by this double attack. During his short parliamentary career he was expelled three times from the Assembly on various pretexts of libel, though his electorate was almost unanimous in his favour.

In 1832 Mackenzie went to England as the bearer of petitions by the Reformers of Upper Canada, seek-

ing redress of the most glaring evils practised by the Executive. During his stay in England he drew up several detailed reports of the colony which were valuable in throwing light upon Canadian affairs, of which the Imperial Government had a very superficial knowledge. He interested several influential English statesmen in the sufferings of the Colony, and obtained a number of concessions from the Colonial Secretary.

When he returned to Canada in 1833 it was with renewed hope for the future, but, unfortunately, a new Colonial Secretary had been appointed, who cancelled all the concessions granted by his predecessor. Yet Mackenzie did not despair, and in 1835 he made another attempt to enlist British sympathy for Upper Canada, by sending to the Imperial Government a detailed report of the chief grievances and recommendations as to means of their removal.

As a result of this report, Sir Francis Bond Head was sent out to Upper Canada, with instructions to adopt conciliatory measures. Instead he decided upon a policy of repression, controlled the elections to secure a Tory majority, and having adopted this high-handed method, lacked both the strength and the intelligence to carry it through. His conduct drove Mackenzie to desperation. Balked of a seat in the Assembly, his party completely blocked in their efforts to reform the administration, he became convinced of Great Britain's apathy to the wrongs of her colony, and determined to resort to arms.

During the course of the rebellion which he had so largely instigated, he was obliged to seek safety in

flight, for a price was on his head, and with great difficulty he made his escape to the United States. Here he renewed his agitation for the independence of Canada, and his efforts met with some response. He was arrested, however, on a charge of violating the American Neutrality Act, was tried, found guilty, and spent a term of eighteen months in prison. On his release he struggled against ill-health and poverty to support his family, and realized the unalloyed bitterness of an exile's lot. In 1849 he was pardoned by the Imperial Government, and returned to Canada where he spent the remainder of his life.

He again entered political life to find that the principle for which he had suffered so keenly—Responsible Government—was firmly established, and the credit given to Baldwin and LaFontaine. The experiences of his life had cast his mind in such a radical mould that he lost sympathy with all but the extreme wing of the Reform party which had once idolized him, and he remained a tireless critic of the Government to the end. He died in 1861, worn out by poverty and the hardships of his career.

It is difficult to estimate the exact share of credit due to William Lyon Mackenzie in the constitutional development of Canada, for after the rebellion Baldwin and LaFontaine took up the thread of Reform, and with a moderation of which he was incapable, wove it gradually into the fabric of Responsible Government. But had it not been for Mackenzie's courageous opposition to the principles represented by the Family Compact, and the powerful impetus that he gave to the cause of Reform, the task of

Baldwin and LaFontaine might have been an impossible one. The rebellion itself was ostensibly a failure—Canadians had to learn that violence is the least efficacious way to achieve reform—and yet, the rebellion of 1837 undoubtedly opened the eyes of the Imperial Government, and hastened the advent of self-government. So, while admitting the error of his appeal to force, we cannot fail to thank Mackenzie for his disinterested share in the development of the Canadian Constitution.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF ELECTORS

WILLIAM LYON MACKENZIE

An address to the Reformers of Upper Canada
Toronto Sept., 1834.

IT is to you who call yourselves the friends of freedom, the advocates of general education, the defenders of the rights of Englishmen, the admirers of all that is noble and generous in the institutions of Britain, the brothers in soul and spirit of that illustrious band of British worthies who in the legislature and in the cabinet have struggled and are yet struggling with the manifold wrongs generated in ages of misrule for the oppression of the millions in our parent nation—it is to you, who through good report and evil report, have proved yourselves sincere and disinterested reformers and friends of your fellow-men that I now address myself, to remind you that the hour approaches in which the Electors of Upper Canada are to decide whether a few factious and aspiring men shall yet a little longer mar the happiness of its inhabitants, or whether an honest and intelligent House of Assembly composed of our most deserving inhabitants will go hand in hand with the King and his excellent Ministers in perfecting our political institution and bestowing on us that free government which although it is not happiness, is, when wisely employed, a sure means of procuring all the prosperity mankind can reasonably look for.

In appealing to the reason, the passions, the feelings and the interest of the people of Upper Canada, I might venture fairly to compare the advantages you

enjoy with the evils of which you complain, and readily admit that your lot even as contrasted with that of your most favoured neighbours is not that of misfortune or which justifies discontent. But, although no human institutions are without imperfections, the blessings enjoyed by the inhabitants of this fine country should not be adduced as a reason why they should remain satisfied with real grievances which can and ought to be removed.

I earnestly entreat you, Brother Reformers, to rouse yourselves, using every exertion until the elections are completed in order to secure throughout the province true and faithful representatives, men who would unite with the present enlightened government of Great Britain in spreading far and wide the elements of useful knowledge, men who would combine and direct the physical energy of the people to purposes of general and individual usefulness, men who would hold no fellowship with those misguided legislators who in the late Legislative Council and Assembly insulted their Sovereign and reproved his Ministers for harkening to your petitions and desiring favourably to entertain your just complaints.

To the resident land-owners of Upper Canada, the lords of the soil, the men who seek for themselves and their children enduring tranquility, free institutions, just laws well administered, I would say that unless they unite in securing the election of men of other principles than have hitherto formed the majorities in the Upper Canadian Parliament, they will assuredly sacrifice their children's best interests. Un-

less a Legislature elected by the freeholders have the control of the public lands and the whole revenue raised from the people, with the power to enact laws of general utility and to repeal statutes found inconvenient, this fine country cannot flourish as it otherwise would. To obtain that control and that power the Executive Council must be removable at the will of the House of Assembly, and the Governor bound to consult them as his constitutional advisers agreeable to British usage; and the authority hitherto exercised in Downing Street of granting large sums of money belonging to the people of Upper Canada without their consent, to purposes they would not sanction, withdrawn. There is good reason to believe that if you elect an intelligent and patriotic House of Assembly all or nearly all of these points will be conceded and it is well known that the British Government is as much opposed to the establishment or continuation of the temporal supremacy of any one class of religious teachers in Canada as the most steady reformer among you.

Under the protection of Great Britain, this Province may arrive at a very great height of prosperity. It is an advantage to have our imports and exports clogged with as few duties as possible at Quebec, and to be under the wing of an old, a rich and powerful nation, able and willing to protect and encourage our trade and agriculture. We cannot be independent. Three hundred thousand settlers, thinly scattered over a vast extent of territory and far distant from the sea could not possibly set up for themselves and even if they could it would be an expensive and

hazardous experiment. Who would protect their foreign trade? Who would guard their immense frontiers? How could they secure a free navigation of the St. Lawrence? But England will throw no obstacle in the way of the settled population if they will but use the power they have to select an honest and capable domestic legislature with whom her present enlightened government can act in concert for the general good.

The chief cause or origin of the grievances which retard the progress of this colony is the power given to successive Secretaries for the Colonies to exercise an undue influence in our domestic affairs. Until now these Secretaries have been free from the control of public opinion in England, and even at this day, when a reformed parliament can check their errors, they may at four thousand miles distance commit many fatal mistakes in directing by deputy the energies of a country few of them ever saw or ever expect to behold.

It is they who appoint our Executive and Legislative Council—it is they who grant places, pensions, sinecures, lands and reserves—it is they who give monopolies to land companies—it is they who direct the expenditure of our land revenue—it is they who select our military governors—it is they who tell us we must pay a chaplain of the House of Assembly a salary to the day of his death for praying, even although we do not employ any person in that capacity —it is they who threw the war losses debt on our shoulders by refusing to apply the land revenue to its liquidation—it is they, who after declaring the

principles of the Upper Canada Commercial Bank charters unfit for the colony, sanctioned institutions which they admitted were built on foundations inconsistent with the permanent interests and future welfare of the people.

When I was in England the leading men there freely admitted that a Colonial Minister could not wisely direct our internal concerns—that he would have to be guided by the governor who acts as his agent here and that as the people here cannot control that governor he in his turn would have to yield to the wishes of his advisers. This system Mr. Hume justly terms a baneful domination, and although he detested the arbitrary acts of Mr. Stanley he now comes forward to acknowledge his conviction that if the freeholders of Upper Canada are ready to do their duty at the ensuing elections they will find Mr. Stanley's successor both able and willing to do his.

Up Brother Reformers! organize committees; appoint canvassers; call meetings; put forth your strength in a good cause, and manifest at the hustings that to you the peace and prosperity of Upper Canada are dear. Be diligent, untiring, faithful and watchful—bring up your brethren who are unable to walk to the polls—cheer the hearts of the downcast—confirm the wavering—and let the frowns of honest men abash every mercenary hireling. Vote for no man whose conduct in private and public life is not above suspicion, and inquire with due diligence before you give your suffrages. Do all this in the strength of that God who has implanted feelings of love and pity and compassion in your breasts towards your

brethren—who has the destiny of empires in His hands—and who will in His good time deliver this beautiful land from the thraldom of wicked and ambitious men, if its inhabitants truly and sincerely perform their duties, actuated by principles and with a single eye to the welfare of their country.

ROBERT BALDWIN

ROBERT BALDWIN

1804-1858

CANADA'S debt to Robert Baldwin is immense. Canadians to-day may well pay homage to the memory of this great patriot, who, without compromising his reputation for honesty, humanity and moderation, fought and won one of the most memorable campaigns in history—the fight for Responsible Government—nobly dedicating his life to this great cause, and dying, old and exhausted, in the prime of life.

Robert Baldwin was born in 1804, at "Muddy York." The son of an ambitious Irishman, who combined in his person the triple offices of doctor, lawyer and schoolmaster, he was himself destined, though devoid of intellectual brilliance, to climb to a high place in the young colony, through sheer industry and perseverance.

After a creditable career in Grammar and Law Schools, he was called to the Bar in 1825 and practised law successfully until the political distresses of his country drew him into the parliamentary ranks to make his great stand for Government by the People.

Baldwin's political career covered a period of twenty years—a period most significant in the development of Canadian history. As early as 1836 he had

become the recognized leader of Reform in Upper Canada, and he was offered a seat in the Executive by the Governor-General, Sir Francis Head, a position which he declined when he divined the governor-general's motive, which was to pacify the Reform party without yielding to their demand for the responsibility of the Executive to the majority of the people.

In 1841 he was again appointed to the Executive Council, and again resigned because he refused to compromise himself or his party on the question of Ministerial Responsibility, but from his position as a member of the Legislature, he brought his influence to bear on the question, and, together with LaFontaine, his colleague from Lower Canada, forced the Government to define its attitude toward Responsible Government, and, subsequently, to resign.

In 1842, Sir Charles Bagot, the new Governor General, having diagnosed the political situation correctly, acceded to the demands of the Reformers, and invited Baldwin and LaFontaine to form a ministry, on the principle of Responsible Government, and though its career was brief, this first Baldwin-LaFontaine administration deserves lasting recognition as the first real cabinet in Canadian history fashioned on the British system of popular control of the Executive.

In 1843, Sir Charles Metcalfe, Bagot's successor, came to Canada, resolved to nip the career of Responsible Government in the bud, and from the outset a series of battles royal ensued between the determined governor, and his equally determined

ministers. In a few months the position of Baldwin and his colleague became intolerable, and they resigned, as a protest against the unconstitutional actions of the Governor-General.

Then began a struggle of prodigious importance into which both sides poured all the fervour and energy which they possessed. Baldwin was the leader in Upper Canada of the agitation against Metcalfe, and spared no effort in the cause of Reform. He delivered many striking speeches throughout the province, bravely holding up his head amid the sneers and accusations of his enemies, and fighting with a gentleman's weapons the battle against prejudice and reaction.

The arrival of Lord Elgin in 1847 terminated the long battle of the Reformers against the Government, and with his advent the victory of Responsible Government was assured. Baldwin and LaFontaine were invited to form a second ministry, and this administration which was known as the "Great Ministry" signalized the ultimate triumph of the principle for which Baldwin had given his life.

The new ministry entered on a crusade against the reigning evils—economic, educational, judicial and political, and to Robert Baldwin is due great credit for the initiation and careful preparation of many prominent measures, chief among which was the Municipal Act of 1849, which carried the principle of self-government to the smallest unit of the state.

Having achieved the boon of self-government, the extreme wing of the Reform party was not content,

but sought more radical changes. Baldwin, an enthusiastic admirer of British institutions, lost sympathy with the extreme wing of his party and, in 1851, resigned from the head of the ministry, proving himself, by this action, a disinterested and consistent disciple of Ministerial Responsibility to the last. He had accomplished the end for which he had striven, and seven years later he died, worn out by his unselfish devotion to his country.

Robert Baldwin has been termed "the man of one idea" and to the tenacity with which he clung to this idea, is due in great measure the political freedom of Canada to-day. Without outstanding gifts of oratory, intellect or social charm, his unassuming and kindly manner, deep sincerity and strength of conviction carried him to a high place in the regard of his countrymen, and won for him the well-deserved title of "a political saviour."

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

Robert Baldwin

Delivered at the first meeting of the Reform Association of Canada, in Toronto, on March 25th, 1844.

I FEEL particularly gratified at the honour which has been conferred upon me in calling upon me to preside at the First General Meeting of the Reform Association of Canada, because it affords the most unquestionable evidence that in your opinion I have proved myself the firm and uncompromising friend of that great and vital principle of British Constitutional Liberty, which it is the great object of the Association to support; and because it shows that while exerting yourselves to insure your country the practical application of that great principle to the administration of all our local affairs, you have repudiated the ungenerous cause of casting by the men who had stood firm to that principle through evil report and good report, in the darkest hour of our country's history; when the doing so was denounced in the highest quarters as incipient treason, as well as when emerging from the cloud of calumny, in which interest and ignorance and despotism had for a time succeeded in enveloping it, this great and truly British principle shone forth in all the splendour of its native truth and excellence, under the expressed sanction of one of the brightest ornaments of the proud aristocracy of the Mother Country, and the specially-appointed High Commissioner and Representative of the Sovereign herself. I refer to Lord Durham.

It affords me also the opportunity of giving expression, in the most unequivocal manner, to my entire approval of the Association; and no exertion, on my part, I can assure you, shall be wanted to forward its object, and make the organization you have recommended as effectual as possible; and, I most earnestly recommend to all who value the principles of the British Constitution, and to whom the preservation of the connection with the Mother Country is dear, to lend your aid by joining such an organization. For, depend upon it, the day will come when one of the proudest boasts of our posterity will be, that they can trace their descent to one who had his name inscribed on this great Roll of the contenders for Colonial rights.

Our objects are open and avowed. We seek no concealment, for we have nothing to conceal. We demand the practical application of the principles of the Constitution of our beloved Mother Country to the administration of our local affairs. Not one hair's breadth farther do we go, or desire to go; not with one hair's breadth short of that will we be ever satisfied. The nature and extent of the demand has never been better expressed than by the great Statesman to whom I have already alluded. Lord Durham in his report to Her Majesty, has nobly vindicated the Reformers of the Province from the foul imputation which had been cast upon them, and I will trespass upon the meeting for a few moments, while I read a few extracts from that great Text Book of Colonial Rights: "The views," says his Lordship, "of the great body of the Reformers appear to have

been limited, according to their favourite expressions to the making of the Colonial Constitution 'an exact transcript' of that of Great Britain, and the only desire that the crown should in Upper Canada, as at home, entrust the administration of affairs to men possessing the confidence of the Assembly."

And, after pointing out the nature of the evil, to the existence of which he attributes the unsatisfactory condition of the Province, he proceeds:—"It is not by weakening but by strengthening the influence of the people on its Government, by confining within much narrower bounds than those hitherto allotted to it and not by extending the interference of the Imperial authorities in the details of Colonial affairs, that I believe that harmony is to be restored where dissension has so long prevailed, and a regularity and vigour hitherto unknown, introduced into the administration of these Provinces. It needs no change in the principles of Government—no invention of a new Constitution theory—to supply the remedy which would, in my opinion, completely remove the existing political disorders. It needs but to follow out consistently the principles of the British Constitution, and introduce into the Government of those great Colonies those wise provisions, by which alone the working of the Representative system can, in any country, be rendered harmonious and efficient. We are not now to consider the policy of establishing Representative Government in the Colonies. That has been irrevocably done and the experiment of depriving the people of their present constitutional powers is not then to be thought of. To conduct

their Government harmoniously, in accordance with its established principles, is now the business of its rulers, and I know not how it is possible to procure that harmony in any other way than by administering the Government on those principles which have been found perfectly efficacious in Great Britain. I would not impair a single prerogative of the Crown; on the contrary, I believe that the interests of the people of the Colonies require the protection of the prerogatives which have not hitherto been exercised. But the Crown must, on the other hand, submit to the necessary consequences of Representative institutions, and if it has to carry on the Government in unison with a representative body, it must consent to carry it on by means of those in whom that representative body has confidence."

Then, after referring to the idle attempt of some to deny the applicability of this principle to a Colony, he proceeds:—"I admit that the system which I propose would, in fact, place the internal Government of the Colonies in the hands of the Colonists themselves, and that we should thus leave to them the execution of the laws, of which we have long entrusted the making, solely to them. I know not in what respect it can be desirable that we should interfere with their internal legislation in matters which do not affect their relations with the Mother Country. Nor can I conceive that any people, or any considerable portion of the people, will view with dissatisfaction a change which would amount simply to this:—that the Crown would, henceforth, consult the wishes of the people in the choice of its servants."

For my part I have taken my stand upon the rock of the British Constitution, and I feel assured that whatever the difficulties are with which we may have to contend, and from whatever quarter they may come, ultimate success is sure to crown our efforts—but we want not only the Constitution, but as regards the administration of our local affairs, the whole Constitution and nothing but the Constitution. By the Constitution the Ministers of the Crown are responsible to Parliament for appointments to office, as well as for every other act of the Government—and was not one of the modes suggested by Lord Durham for carrying out his proposed change in the practical administration of Provincial affairs, though not the only nor the best one, "that the official acts of the Governor" should be "countersigned by some public functionary?" Does he not expressly deprecate as most injurious to the relations subsisting between the Colony and the Parent State the maintenance of a contest in order that a Governor or Secretary of State may be able to confer Colonial appointments on one rather than on another set of men in the Colonies? And, do not Lord Sydenham's Resolutions of 1841 most distinctly point out the express object of the constitutional necessities for the management of our local affairs, being conducted by and with the assistance, counsel and information of a provincial administration, under the head of the Government, to be for the purpose of affording a guarantee "that the well-understood wishes and interests of the people should, on all occasions be faithfully represented and advocated?"

How can such wishes and interests be represented or advocated if those who are so to represent and advocate them are not to be consulted? And yet in the face of all this, with the very same breath that it is admitted that "appointments and proposals to make appointments" had been made without consulting his Ministers, the head of the Government is advised to declare that he had hitherto pursued the system of Responsible Government without deviation, and to profess his concurrence in the Resolutions of 1841. And a hope appears to be entertained that by a constant repetition of the assertion in the shape of answers to addresses, the people of Canada have so little of intelligence and so crude a notion of their rights that they will at least be persuaded to believe it.

I doubt not that the head of the Government has practised Responsible Government as the Governor-General has been pleased to interpret it—and of course being in his estimation a "yet undefined question" we cannot wonder if in preparing a definition for his own particular convenience he left a large margin for the benefit of that constitution which favoured the exercise of a practically irresponsible and despotic power. But I feel convinced that the people of this country are not such a set of children as to be satisfied with a mere bauble because it is called "Responsible Government." You have been contending for a substance not for a shadow. And the question for the country to decide, is whether we are in effect to go back to the old system under the new name, or whether we are to have Responsible Government in reality, as practically acted upon in the Mother

Country. "A rose," it was said, "by any other name would smell as sweet," and I will venture to say that the poppy would be equally disagreeable to the sense and equally deleterious in its effect, though dignified with the name of the Queen of flowers. If we are to have the old system let us have it under its new name, "the Irresponsible System," "the Compact System," or any other adapted to its hideous deformities; but let us not be imposed upon by a mere name. We were adjured with reference to this new-fangled Responsible Government in a style and manner borrowed with no small degree of care from that of the eccentric Baronet who once represented the Sovereign in this part of her Majesty's Dominion (Sir F. B. Head), "to keep it," "cling to it" and "not to throw it away." You all no doubt, remember the story of little Red Riding Hood, and the poor child's astonishment and alarm as she began to trace the features of the wolf instead of those of her venerable grandmother. Let the people of Canada beware lest when they begin to trace the real outlines of this new-fangled Responsible Government, and are calling out in the simplicity of their hearts. "Oh! Grandmother what great big eyes you have! Oh! Grandmother what a great big nose you've got!" it may not, as in the case of poor little Red Riding Hood, be too late, and the reply to the exclamation "Oh! Grandmother what a great big mouth you have!" be, "that's to gobble you up the better, my child!"

LOUIS LAFONTAINE

LOUIS LAFONTAINE
1807-1864

LOUIS LAFONTAINE will not soon be forgotten in French Canada. The romantic glamour which surrounds the memory of Papineau dims the milder lustre of his less picturesque countryman, but in the page of actual achievement, LaFontaine far outshines his eloquent rival. He possessed that sense of proportion which Papineau lacked and which, at all times necessary for high statesmanship, was indispensable in the critical period to which both men belonged.

At the beginning of his public career LaFontaine pledged himself to the cause of French nationalism in Canada, and throughout his life he was a jealous guardian of the privileges of his race. His patient endeavours to place Lower Canada on a basis of equality with Upper Canada, in language, laws and representation met with a success which was denied the agitations of more impetuous leaders.

He was a man of impressive personality, with keen mentality, an indomitable will, and a love of moderation which fitted him admirably for the position of leader of the Reform party in Lower Canada. His countrymen supported him with loyal enthusiasm, and relied on his ability to save them from the jaws of political extinction.

At first LaFontaine was a bitter opponent of Union, but when he saw that his efforts to avert it were hopeless, he resigned himself to the inevitable, and espoused the cause of Responsible Government as the one salvation of his race. With commendable wisdom he united with Robert Baldwin, the Reform leader of Upper Canada, and despite the radical differences of race and religion, the two Reformers worked harmoniously over a period of twenty years, demonstrating by their concerted action that a political union of two races was not impossible, and initiating the policy which remained the backbone of the Canadian political system until Confederation.

During the anxious years between the passing of the Union Act, and the final adoption of Responsible Government, the successive Governor-Generals sought to conciliate LaFontaine, who held Lower Canada in the hollow of his hand, by offers of various political sinecures, but he remained true to his trust and refused to sacrifice the interests of his race to private gain. He had one mission to perform,—the preservation of French nationality through the medium of Responsible Government—and he would accept no compromise which might impede or delay the realization of his aim.

In the two "LaFontaine-Baldwin" ministries he played an important part, effecting many badly-needed reforms in Lower Canada, and in 1849 introducing the Rebellion Losses Bill which established on a firm base the loyalty of French Canadians to the British Government.

When the triumph of Responsible Government was

assured, LaFontaine retired from political life, confident that his task was accomplished. French-Canadianism was a recognized factor in Canadian life, the privileges of his race were identical with those of British Canadians, and the successful workings of Responsible Government offered a security for the future.

Subsequently, as a jurist in Lower Canada, LaFontaine won a reputation which rivalled his success as a politician, but it is for his great contribution to Canadian political development that his name will be longest remembered. He died in 1864 deeply lamented by a large following of both nationalities.

The study of history reveals the significance of personality in the shaping of great events. Had a statesman with LaFontaine's wisdom, tact and moderation not appeared at the crucial moment in Canadian politics, the union of the Canadas would doubtless have ended in disaster, and the history of Canada been radically changed. He succeeded in proving, for the guidance of future statesmen, that the union of two distinct nationalities was compatible with peace and harmony, and obliterated the dismal picture which Lord Durham had painted "of two races warring within the bosom of a single state."

FRENCH CANADA AND RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

LOUIS LAFONTAINE

Delivered at Montreal, October, 1851, at a banquet given in his honour upon his withdrawal from public life.

TWENTY-ONE years ago, when I first entered upon political life, we were under a very different government. I refer to the method of its administration. We had a government in which the parliament had no influence,—the government of all British colonies. Under this government the people had no power, save only the power of refusing subsidies. This was the sole resource of the House of Assembly, and we can readily conceive with what danger such a resource was fraught. It was but natural that this system should give occasion to many abuses.

We commenced, therefore, our struggle to extirpate these abuses, to establish that form of government that it was our right to have and which we have to-day,—true responsible English government. Let it be borne in mind that under our former system of government all our struggles were vain and produced only that racial hate and animosity which is happily passing from us to-day, and which, I venture to hope, this banquet may tend still further to dissipate.

I hope that I give offence to none if, in speaking of the union of the provinces, I say that history will record the fact that the union was a project, which, in the mind of its author, aimed at the annihilation of the French-Canadians. It was in this light that I regarded it. But after having subsequently ex-

amined with care this rod of chastisement that had been prepared against my compatriots, I besought some of the most influential among them to let me make use of this very instrument to save those whom it was designed to ruin, to place my fellow-countrymen in a better position than any they had ever occupied. I saw that this measure contained in itself the means of giving to the people the control which they ought to have over the government, of establishing a real government in Canada. It was under these circumstances that I entered parliament. The rest you know. From this moment we began to understand responsible government, the favourite watchword of to-day,—it was then that it was understood that the governor must have as his executive advisers men who possessed the confidence of the public, and it was thus that I came to take part in the administration.

For fifteen months things went fairly well. Then came the struggle between the Ministry, of which I formed part, and Governor Metcalfe. The result of this struggle has been that you now have in this country not merely the form of Responsible Government, but the spirit—indeed, the thing itself; the true counterpart of the British Constitution. Power to-day is in the hands of the people, who exercise a salutary action on the Government; and a vote of want of confidence in the Ministry passed by the majority of the House of Assembly, will constrain the Representative of the Crown to call other and more popular men to his Councils.

Let us take a glance at the present Administration

—at what it has done. We see to-day united under it the different parts of the country; canals which cannot fail to be of immense advantage to the country's future. Has one measure which commanded the approval of the people been rejected by the Imperial Government or its representative in this Province, since 1848? No,—and this fact should convince you that there need be no more fears entertained for the fate of measures truly necessary and beneficial as in times past. The danger to-day is the facility with which we may legislate; and if we continue to disregard the possibility of the abuse which may arise from this power, your code will shortly become a labyrinth, from which it will be difficult when once you have entered it, to extricate yourself. But, if this be an abuse, it tends to prove my proposition that the popular will reigns, and that all measures proceeding from the people are well received . . .

I have said that the union was intended to annihilate the French-Canadians. But the result has been very different. The author of the union was mistaken. He wished to degrade one race among our citizens, but the facts have shown that both races among us stand upon the same footing. The very race that has been trodden under foot now finds itself, in some sort by this union, in a position of command to-day. Such is the position in which I leave the people of my race.

THOMAS CHANDLER HALIBURTON

THOMAS CHANDLER HALIBURTON
1796-1865

THE author of Sam Slick stands in the forefront of Canadian literary history. Unique in Canadian literature, "The sayings and doings of the Clockmaker" reveal a spontaneous humour and a profound philosophy of life. If Haliburton was not as Artemus Ward has said "The founder of the American school of humour," there is no doubt that he was "one of the shrewdest of humourists," and his writings both humorous and historical had a distinct influence on later American authors.

This brilliant writer, lawyer and politician was born in Windsor, Nova Scotia, in 1796. Educated at the Windsor Grammar School and Kings College, he became a member of the House of Assembly for Annapolis in the year 1826. His debates were naturally characterized by a tendency toward humour, but at times he was a forceful and effective speaker. It is said that on one occasion a youthful reporter, afterwards Nova Scotia's greatest orator, paused pen in hand, to listen to his eloquence. Thus the record of a memorable speech was lost.

In 1829 he was appointed Chief Justice of the Inferior Court of Common Pleas for the Middle Division of Nova Scotia, the youngest judge in that court. A justice of the Supreme Court in 1841, he came

closely in touch with all classes, and his experience gave him a keen insight into human nature. His writings are replete with allusions to the foibles and weaknesses of his countrymen. In 1856 he left his native province for England, where he lived for the remainder of his life.

He was always a strong advocate of imperialism and when in 1859 he became a member of the House of Commons for Launceston he thanked his electors "on behalf of four million of British subjects on the other side of the water, who, up to the present time had not had one individual in the House of Commons, through whom they might be heard."

Though a prophet in his own country he could not foresee that while he was urging imperial unity in the House of Commons, fifteen miles from his home in the village of Grand Pré, was a boy, who was to be the first colonial premier summoned to an Imperial Conference. Nor when he defended the rights of the timber merchants of New Brunswick against an act which threatened seriously to injure their interests, could he foresee that a native of that very province would in 1922 become prime minister of England.

Author of the first history of Nova Scotia, creator of the inimitable Sam Slick, Judge Haliburton died at Isleworth on the Thames in 1865.

Thomas Chandler Haliburton

IMPERIAL FEDERATION

From an address at Glasgow, 1857.

MY object is to draw together in more intimate bonds of connection the two countries, to remove distrust, to assimilate interests, to combine the raw material of the New, with the manufacturing skill of the Old World, to enlarge the boundaries, to widen the foundations, to strengthen the constitution, and to add to the grandeur of the Empire. My object is to unite indissolubly the two parties of the Empire, so that there may be but one interest, one country with one constitution, one parliament, one language, one literature, one and the same monarch and one and the same great and glorious old flag, "that for a thousand years has braved the battle and the breeze." This is my object, and I trust it will be yours also, now, while it yet can be effected, ere separate interests, and the angry passions they engender, draw us asunder too widely and too rudely ever to admit of reunion.

The retention or loss of your colonies is, in my opinion, a question of infinitely more importance than all others put together. We have heard of justice to Ireland till we have caught the Irish accent, and more recently, with more reason, of justice to Scotland; but if you think I am going to raise the cry of "justice to the colonies," you are mistaken. We are able to do ourselves justice, and most assuredly will do so, when occasion requires. I come not here to threaten you, I know you too well for that, and I come not

to supplicate you, for I am too much of a Scotchman, and too proud for that also. But I come to warn you, in sorrow, and not in anger, seriously, but amicably, that if there be not a change in the colonial policy of this Empire, the distant extremities will inevitably fall off from the body-politic, from their own unwieldy bulk and ponderosity.

Previous to the American Revolution, Dr. Benjamin Franklin visited this country, and warned the government that, unless its policy was more judicious and more conciliatory, it would lose the old colonies. His advice was unheeded and his prophecy was fulfilled. I do not pretend to compare myself with him; I have neither his talents nor his knowledge. But I know as much of the feeling of my countrymen as he did, and without any disparagement to him, I am infinitely more attached to this country than he ever was. For all my predilections are monarchical, and not republican. In like manner I now warn you that there are other subjects more important than the bombardment of Canton, the fall of Herat, or the establishment of the Danubian boundary. And first and foremost among them is the retention of British America. Don't mistake me, I am no agitator; I don't like agitation, even for a good object. I am not a man with a hobby to ride on perpetually—for such a person is a great bore; nor a man with a grievance, a character that is very troublesome; but a loyal colonist, very fond of his own country, enthusiastically attached to this, and an advocate for an intimate and indissoluble union of both. You may here say, as has often been said: "You have a re-

sponsible government; you manage your own affairs, what do you complain of?"

I shall answer this question, and I am happy to do so, here among practical, reflecting, thinking men, among men who will understand me when I do speak, and who, I am certain, will agree with me when they hear me. First, I say, we don't complain; and, secondly, we not only don't govern our own affairs, but have no voice in their management, and are not even consulted about them. I say we don't complain, and for two short reasons; first, we have nobody to complain to; and, secondly, if we had, we have no means of making ourselves heard. We have been told with much superciliousness by a noble Lord, who had the happy knack of embroiling himself with every colony in turn, that, "when we are ripe for independence, and desire it, no objection will be made to it." We are obliged to him for his permission, but assure him his consent is not required. He cannot accelerate it, or his insolence would long since have accomplished it; he cannot retard it, for no one values his opinion. Neither do we govern our own affairs; we manage our local matters, and there our power ends, as I shall show you. But if we don't complain, I shall tell you what we say. We say that our Eastern and Western provinces, together with our other foreign possessions contain a population of one hundred millions of colonists, and that they are all unrepresented; that they are all so distinct and disjointed that England, in her hour of need, as lately in the Crimea, could draw no assistance in men or money from them, though they were able and willing

to have contributed both; and that where this is the case, there is something wrong in the organization of the empire. We say that, in North America there are five colonies, covering a space larger than all Europe, unconnected among themselves, and unconnected with England, with five separate jurisdictions, five separate tariffs, five different currencies, and five different codes of laws; with no common bond of union, and no common interest; with no power to prevent the aggression of strangers, or of one on the other; no voice in the regulation of their trade, their intercourse with each other, with foreign powers, or with England. We say that our rights are bartered away without our concurrence, and without our knowledge; that recently a treaty, relative to the fisheries of Nova Scotia, was entered into with the United States, with no other notice to us than to choose delegates to attend and advise (the delegates were chosen, but were never asked to meet the Commissioner, and the treaty was signed without them), that the people were compelled to submit and adopt it, by a threat from the Americans that they would punish their refusal by discriminating duties. This was done in such haste that the fishery limits were left unsettled, and greater confusion and trouble has ensued than previously existed.

When Lord Ashburton ceded more than four millions of the best timber lands of New Brunswick, together with nearly 150 miles of the St. John, and a right of passage through the remainder of the River to the Ocean (also the best mail route to Canada), we think it not unreasonable that the people of the

Province should have had a voice in the arrangement of the treaty, or the right, and the power to call him to account in Parliament. We ask, if Canada had had a representative in the House of Commons, or delegates in the Colonial Office, whether Newfoundland would have been permitted to grant, as it has done, a monopoly to an American company for a European line of telegraph to her exclusion, so that she must now derive her English news from New York; or if Great Britain thinks proper to give a permission of registration to Americans for their vessels, without an equivalent, whether it is equally right to grant a similar privilege to them in the Colonies, without their consent, or in like manner to grant them a coasting trade, without reciprocity in their ports, whereby our commerce is crippled in a way only intelligible to merchants. For instance, an American steamer can leave Boston, with freight and passengers for St. John, New Brunswick, touching at all the intermediate ports of the States, but a colonial vessel must proceed direct to her port of destination, nor can she take freight from any port or place on the Atlantic, to California or any port in the Pacific, because that they interpret to be a coasting voyage. I stop not to enquire if this is right or wrong, but it seems to be no more than decent, when the rights of others are legislated away in this manner, that their concurrence should at least be asked. It may be as well here to state what our neighbours the Americans say, who never lose an opportunity of sowing the seeds of disaffection among our people:— "Why do you," they say, "continue in the degraded

position of a dependency to England, when you might become free and independent by joining us? Instead of having your territory ceded to others, your fisheries bartered away, and your rights denied or withheld, you would be protected and incorporated with us; you would return above a hundred members for Congress (you are not entitled to one in Parliament); you and your children would be eligible to the highest offices in our great nation (you are excluded from all in Great Britain); your real estate would be increased in value, and your commerce immensely enlarged, and you would at once take your place among the nations of the Earth; but there is no accounting for taste, bondage may have its charms, though we do not understand them," and so on. On all this I have but one observation to make, and it is this: an allegiance like ours, that neither neglect nor indifference can extinguish, nor reward nor ridicule seduce, would, in the estimation of any other Government under Heaven but that of England, be considered above all praise and beyond all price. In your turn, you may well say: "Do you put forward your bonfires, your illuminations and rejoicings at our success at Sebastopol (if success it was), and your legislative grants in aid of the compassionate fund, as a suitable contribution to the expenses of war?"

It is a reasonable and a rational question to ask, and there is an answer to it. An offer was made to raise two regiments in Canada, and conduct them to the Crimea, to be commanded by colonial officers, but to be, like others, under the command of the General-in-Chief, whoever he might be. The offer

was returned from London unanswered—*it had been addressed to the wrong office.*

But I have done—I have stated to you a situation of affairs that cannot last. There are four remedies: First, Annexation to the States. Secondly, A Federal Union of the Colonies, a Colonial Board of Control, instead of the Downing Street Bureau, and what the Americans call Territorial Representation, that is Delegates in Parliament, to advocate colonial rights, and vote on them, and them only. Thirdly, Incorporation with Great Britain, and a fair share of full representation. Fourthly, Independence. Time forbids me to enter upon these topics: I submit them for your calm and deliberate consideration. The period has arrived when you and your colonists must take counsel together. All my wishes and my hopes point to a union between you, and my last words are "*esto perpetua.*"

OLIVER MOWAT

OLIVER MOWAT

1820-1903

FIFTY years of disinterested public service have entitled Oliver Mowat to a prominent place on Canada's scroll of Fame. Whether as alderman, judge, cabinet minister, senator, premier or lieutenant-governor, his energies were devoted to the development of his country, and throughout his long career his reputation remained untarnished.

He was descended from the ancient family of Mowats of Caithness, Scotland, and was born in Kingston, Upper Canada, where his parents had settled in their youth. He was educated in private schools, carefully grounded in classics, and at the age of sixteen years entered the law office of John A. Macdonald, who was destined to become his political opponent.

In the crisis of 1837 young Mowat enlisted in the First Battalion of Frontenac Militia, and for a time it appeared as if the son were to inherit the political beliefs of his father, who was a Conservative by temperament and conviction. But politics attracted him little at this juncture, for he was absorbed in his legal studies, and as late as 1844 he refused to vote because of his avowed ignorance of the political situation in Canada.

In 1840 he came to Toronto to complete his legal education, and in the following year he was admitted

to the Bar. His success was assured from the first, for besides his enthusiasm for his work he possessed accuracy of judgment, a clear logical mind, and a strong, independent spirit. By 1854 he was one of the leaders in his profession, and his love of honesty and fair play increased the prestige which his ability had won for him.

As his legal success increased his interest in politics deepened, and he devoted his leisure to the study of the situation in Canada, weighing the merits of both parties with impartial judgment. Eventually he decided that the ideals of the Reform party were more conducive to the development of Canada, and, consequently, he attached himself to George Brown and his followers. In 1857, after a year of municipal service as a preface to public life, he entered the Legislature, upholding, as did his more explosive leader, the principles of "representation by population" and "free non-sectarian education." He became a power among the Liberals, and at the Reform Convention held in 1859 to seek a panacea for the ills which beset the government, he made a memorable speech in favour of Federal union, as opposed to Legislative union. This meeting was the tiny mustard seed out of which the mighty tree of Confederation evolved.

In 1863 he joined the Cabinet as Postmaster General, and, again after the deadlock occurred, resumed his portfolio in the Brown-Macdonald Cabinet which was formed in 1865 to support Confederation. He was one of the so-called Fathers of Confederation, and although absent from the Char-

lottetown Conference, was an important figure at the Quebec Convention, where he stood up manfully for provincial autonomy and opposed John A. Macdonald's demand for centralization.

Just before the dawn of Confederation he retired from politics to accept the Vice Chancellorship of Upper Canada, a position for which he was well fitted with his fairness and soundness of judgment, and which he held until 1872, when he left it to assume the Premiership of Ontario.

During his long term of office as Premier, Ontario made remarkable progress. His industry was unremitting, and he fathered many valuable reforms which set the pace for the other provinces. Roads were built, public buildings erected, education and immigration were encouraged, and hosts of other valuable measures were introduced. But it was for his stoic defence of provincial rights, when Sir John Macdonald made repeated attempts to encroach on provincial autonomy, that he deserves lasting credit. In eight famous cases the Privy Council decided in Mowat's favour, and an enduring recognition of provincial rights was secured.

In 1896 the Liberal Party came into power at Ottawa, and Mowat resigned the premiership on Laurier's appeal for support. He entered the Liberal Cabinet as Minister of Justice, but after a year of hard work, decided that his new duties were too strenuous for his impaired vitality, and accepted instead the Lieutenant-Governorship of Ontario, in which office he died in 1903.

Sir Oliver Mowat was a strong Imperialist and

vigorously opposed the Annexation movement which had found favour in some quarters. He was not a bigoted party man for he weighed every political measure with impartial judgment. It was only natural that a man of his moral fibre should prefer the blunt honesty of George Brown and Alexander Mackenzie to the humorous blandishments of Sir John A. Macdonald, but apart from the individual characters of the Liberal leaders, he approved of the policy which the Reform party had adopted, and having made his decision, he stuck to it loyally. He was not an eloquent orator, and he often lacked the saving sense of humour which characterized Sir John, but his genuine ability, integrity, and sympathy won him the respect of Conservative and Liberal alike. At his death the mourning was universal and no one denied the aptness of the quotation which his subordinate and successor, George W. Ross, employed, to describe his public life:

"Not making his high place the lawless perch
Of winged ambition, but through all that tract of years,
Wearing the white flower of a blameless life."

THE FAILURE OF LEGISLATIVE UNION

OLIVER MOWAT

Delivered at the Reform Association, Toronto, November 9, 1859.

IT requires little to convince this assembly or the people of this country that we can no longer delay the making of some change in the constitution. The feeling in favour of representation according to population has for some time been general, and there has been an impression, as strong as any that ever was formed, that if the Union is to continue in its present form, that is the only principle that can be regarded as just or equal. It is not because I have less zeal for that principle than I have hitherto had, that I now come forward to advocate a change in—or, I should say rather, an addition to—the platform we have assumed in the struggle now making in favour of good government. The question has been put—and it was right that it should be put—as to the necessity which exists for making any such alteration. We have fought long for representation according to population, but we have discovered that it will take a much longer time than many of us have supposed to secure the recognition of that principle. It is certain that there is the most resolute determination on the part of Lower Canada to resist this demand; and if we ask for dissolution pure and simple it will take a long time to remove the obstacles thus presented. The only alternative is an appeal to the Home Government; and we ought not to call upon them unnecessarily. We may be driven to it, but

it should be the last resort. We must first try to settle our difficulties among ourselves. Again, it is doubtful whether the Home Government would interfere to give us representation according to population till after a long continued application; and in the meantime what are we not enduring? If we were only well governed by Lower Canada; if she gave us good laws, such as we desire, we might bear with the power she has of preventing us from making such laws for ourselves—we might afford to wait. But she does not do so. The Lower Canadians impose upon us laws which we do not want. The legislation of the last two years has been legislation directed against Upper Canada, and in favour of Lower Canada.

It is plain that if we desire the interests of this country, if we wish to secure ourselves against bankruptcy, we must look out for some other measure than representation according to population in order to obtain relief.

Is there then, a shorter method to obtain those rights of which for some time past we have been deprived? That is the question to be decided. Before the period of Responsible Government there was a state of things in this country which no free people would endure. I do not sympathize with those who tried to alter it by force, but I do feel that when an eminent English statesman said our Government was one for which, had he lived under it, he would not fight, the state of things must have been very deplorable indeed. But let us ask ourselves if our present condition is not worse than that of which

Lord Sydenham made the observation I have quoted, —when the country was ruled by the Family Compact; when the legislation desired by the majority of the people and of their representatives was checked by a party with whom the people did not sympathize, and when the Executive Government was in the hands of that party. I ask if the state of things which now prevails is not still worse? It is true that we were not then ruled by the majority, but by the minority; but, after all, it was an English influence which prevailed. Our affairs were controlled by those who should not have managed them; but at least they were controlled by men living among ourselves, brought up as we were, understanding our language, reading our newspapers and to whose minds we had access through these and through our speeches. But those who rule us now are of another language, another race, another country; knowing nothing of Upper Canada, with other views, other sympathies and other interests. Is there any comparison between the condition of things then and now? If, in the minds of English statesmen—with whom, however I do not agree—there was enough to induce them to say that men were justified in resisting then, what are we to say of our condition now?

Our remedy, however, is a constitutional one; but we do right to remember and reflect upon the evils that we suffer in order that we may not be heedless of the remedy. As freemen we cannot help loving liberty, and what we have to do is to see whether by constitutional means we may not obtain the reform of our grievances, and that by a course shorter than

the one by which we have hitherto been following. Without going into all these evils and remedies, I will say a word or two here of the two remedies between which I believe Upper Canada is now hesitating, namely: a separation from Lower Canada at all hazards, or a separation which would continue the connection for some purposes with freedom from its controlling influence in regard to others. As to a dissolution of the Union pure and simple there are immense difficulties. There are the geographical relations of the two provinces, the tariff, the navigation of the St. Lawrence, and the debt, all to be arranged. If the relations between the two provinces before the Union created bad feeling, the antagonism of that day would be greatly magnified now, when we possess public works not then in existence, and when the population, wealth and trade of Upper Canada are so enormously augmented. Is it likely that all these things can be arranged in any reasonable time? There are doubtless many in Lower Canada who, notwithstanding their favourable position, are in favour of a repeal of the Union; but they simply desire a return to the former state of things. There is no likelihood of the majority in that part of the country consenting to the necessary arrangements within a time shorter than would be requisite even to obtain representation by population; and, of course, without violence, there is only one other method than persuasion, and that is by means of an appeal to the Imperial Government. But every one who has studied the feeling of the British people, or the dealings of the British Government with this country, must be

satisfied that that Government will not like the Union to be repealed. Its repeal will certainly take a long time. I am not satisfied that it can be accomplished at all.

But supposing the dissolution of the Union to be that desirable thing at which we should aim, is not the shortest way to accomplish even that, the obtaining in the first instance of this federation, which will be more easily carried? The statesmen of England are not opposed to federation in the Maritime Provinces, and they will therefore not be against it here. There is also strong reason to think that Lower Canada is prepared to favour the scheme; for though the Lower Canadians have the power now, they feel that the unjust exercise of it may come home to them; that the more they abuse their power now, the more we may be disposed to retaliate when we shall have the power in our hands. Federation will vest the local government of each part of the two provinces within itself, so that we may get by it all the advantages of dissolution without its difficulties. As to the subject of expense, there can be no doubt that in Upper Canada, at least, the federal system will be much cheaper than the present one; and, on the whole, looking at the two systems together, and even regarding them from the point of view taken by those who are in favour of dissolution, I can see no objection whatever to the federation now proposed.

JOHN A. MACDONALD

JOHN A. MACDONALD

1815-1891

AT no period in Canadian history has personality been such a potent force as in the movement for Confederation. Strong men of widely divergent temperaments upheld the cause of union in the various provinces, but without the welding power exerted by Sir John A. Macdonald Confederation would have been impossible. With his genial common sense, tact and immense personal magnetism, he united the varying elements in the struggle and converted into reality the dream of visionaries throughout British North America.

John A. Macdonald came from Glasgow in 1820, with his parents, and received his education at Kingston where the family settled. He studied law, was called to the Bar in 1836, and practised successfully until he was drawn into politics in 1844. He entered the legislature as Conservative member for Kingston, and represented this constituency for over forty years.

At the beginning of his political career he was conservative in the extreme, and sympathized with the "Family Compact" in Upper Canada, even taking up arms against the rebels in 1837. Throughout his life he was slow to adopt new policies, but when convinced of the wisdom of a proposed measure,

was resolute in its execution. Nor was he a narrow partisan, for he recognized genius in the ranks of his opponents, and united with men of opposite politics to secure the achievement of his aims.

In 1847 Macdonald entered the Cabinet under Draper, and by 1854 became, with Cartier, the dominating force in the Ministry. Their influence was effectual in securing the abolishment of Seignorial Tenure in Lower Canada, and the secularization of Clergy Reserves in Upper Canada, Macdonald consistently upheld the French and Roman Catholic interests, and came into open conflict with George Brown, who was the special champion of Upper Canadian and Protestant rights. In 1857 Macdonald became Premier, but despite his political genius, he was unable to avert the approaching deadlock, due to the opposing forces in the Legislature, and the crisis came in June, 1864.

George Brown suggested a scheme of federation as a solution of the difficulty, and Macdonald seized upon the plan with enthusiasm, agreeing to unite with his rival to ensure its success. A coalition government was formed which devoted itself to the task of confederation, and Macdonald became the leader of the movement.

He was a prominent speaker at the Charlottetown Conference, dominated the Quebec Conference, and introduced the measure in the Canadian Assembly where it was passed, after a struggle, with a large majority. Throughout the dark days when the Maritime Provinces opposed the measure, his faith and good humour was unfailing, and in 1867, when

the British North America Act was framed at a conference in London, Macdonald was recognized as the controlling power among the Fathers of the Confederation.

He was chosen as first Premier of the Dominion. and ably performed the task of reconciling the provinces to their new position. A less magnetic statesman would have found the task impossible, but Sir John's power to transform enemies to friends seldom failed him, and by 1872 the new Dominion was secure. He sought to cement the union by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but, always a Machiavelli in his politics, allowed his zeal to override his scruples, and was ousted from power by the resulting "Pacific Scandal" of 1873.

His buoyant nature could not be long suppressed, however, and, five years later, he was returned to office, his popularity as strong as ever, on the impetus of the National Policy. During his second administration the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed, and various legislative measures were passed, which contributed to the development of the country. He remained in harness to the end, carrying his last election in 1891 by his personality alone and dying a few weeks later mourned by the nation which his magic had called into existence.

Imperialism was one of the strongest tenets of Sir John A. Macdonald's political creed, and throughout his life his imperialistic principles suffered no change. But his love for the Empire did not lessen his affection for the young nation which he had fostered into life.

Instead, it gave a broader significance to his nationalism. Indeed, the secret of his success as a statesman lay in the breadth of his views, and the great encompassing love of humanity and life which characterized this lovable, humorous, scheming, wholly-human veteran of Canadian politics.

THE ADVANTAGES OF CONFEDERATION

JOHN A. MACDONALD

From his address introducing the Act of Confederation, 1865

THE colonies are now in a transition state. Gradually a different colonial system is being developed—and it will become, year by year, less a case of dependence on our part, and of overruling protection on the part of the Mother Country, and more a case of a healthy and cordial alliance. Instead of looking upon us as a merely dependent colony, England will have in us a friendly nation—a subordinate but still a powerful people—to stand by her in North America in peace or in war. The people of Australia will be such another subordinate nation. And England will have this advantage, if her colonies progress under the new colonial system, as I believe they will, that, though at war with all the rest of the world, she will be able to look to the subordinate nations in alliance with her, and owning allegiance to the same Sovereign, who will assist in enabling her again to meet the whole world in arms, as she has done before. And if, in the great Napoleonic war, with every port in Europe closed against her commerce, she was yet able to hold her own, how much more will that be the case when she has a colonial empire rapidly increasing in power, in wealth, in influence, and in position? It is true that we stand in danger, as we have stood in danger again and again in Canada, of being plunged into war, and of suffering all its dreadful consequences, as the result of causes

over which we have no control, by reason of their connection. This, however, did not intimidate us. At the very mention of the prospect of a war some time ago, how were the feelings of the people aroused from one extremity of British America to the other, and preparations made for meeting its worst consequences!

Although the people of this country are fully aware of the horrors of war—should a war arise, unfortunately, between the United States and England, and we all pray it never may—they are still ready to encounter all perils of that kind, for the sake of the connection with England. There is not one adverse voice, not one adverse opinion on that point. We all feel the advantages we derive from our connection with England. So long as that alliance is maintained, we enjoy, under her protection, the privileges of constitutional liberty according to the British system. We shall enjoy here that which is the great test of constitutional freedom—we shall have the rights of the minority respected. In all countries the rights of the majority take care of themselves, but it is only in countries like England, enjoying constitutional liberty, and safe from the tyranny of a single despot or of an unbridled democracy, that the rights of the minorities are regarded. So long, too, as we form a portion of the British Empire, we shall have the example of her free institutions, of the high standard of the character of her statesmen and public men, of the purity of her legislation, and the upright administration of her laws. In this younger country one great advantage of our

connection with Great Britain will be, that, under her auspices, inspired by her example, a portion of her empire, our public men will be actuated by principles similar to those which actuate the statesmen at home. These, although not material, physical benefits, of which you can make an arithmetical calculation, are of such overwhelming advantages to our future interests and standing as a nation, that to obtain them is well worthy of any sacrifices we may be called upon to make, and the people of this country are ready to make them.

We should feel, also, sincerely grateful to beneficent Providence that we have had the opportunity vouchsafed us of calmly considering this great constitutional change, this peaceful revolution, that we have not been hurried into it, like the United States, by the exigencies of war, that we have not had a violent revolutionary period forced on us, as in other nations, by hostile action from without, or by domestic dissensions within. Here we are in peace and prosperity, under the fostering government of Great Britain—a dependent people, with a government having only a limited and delegated authority, and yet allowed, without restriction, and without jealousy on the part of the Mother Country, to legislate for ourselves, and peacefully and deliberately to consider and determine the future of Canada and of British North America.

GEORGE BROWN

GEORGE BROWN

1818-1880

THE keynote of George Brown's character was sounded by an Edinburgh schoolmaster in the remark: "He is not only endowed with high enthusiasm, but possesses the faculty of creating enthusiasm in others." The deep imprint which he made subsequently on Canadian history is attributable to the zest with which he flung himself into the political affairs of his adopted country, and the kindred spark he roused in the breasts of his followers.

George Brown was born near Edinburgh in 1818, the son of a Lowland father and a Celtic mother. From his parents he imbibed a strong love of freedom and justice which found expression in his later struggles against negro slavery, clerical domination, and political tyranny.

In 1838 business reverses led the Browns to New York, where, a few years later, they established a magazine called the *British Chronicle*, for Scottish readers in the United States and Canada. In 1843 George Brown came to Canada to promote the Canadian circulation of the journal, and became keenly interested in the political situation of Upper Canada. As a result of this visit the Browns moved to Toronto and established the "Banner," in the interests of Presbyterianism and Self-Government.

By 1844 the *Banner*, avowedly non-partisan, was drawn into the political embroglio, and was reincarnated under the name of *The Globe*, a Liberal journal devoted to the cause of Responsible Government, and a staunch ally of Baldwin and LaFontaine. It grew rapidly in size and importance and throughout George Brown's life exerted a powerful influence on Canadian public opinion.

In 1851 George Brown made his début in the Legislative Assembly, as an advocate of the separation of Church and State, non-sectarian education, Reciprocity with the United States and a reform of parliamentary representation. Throughout his career he was a consistent adherer to his first principles, and spared neither time nor talents in seeking to convert them into laws.

His influence in the Assembly was marked from the outset. His honesty, courage and vigour won the confidence of his party, and by 1856 he was the recognized leader of the Liberals in Upper Canada. Later he became the very mouthpiece of Upper Canadian sentiment. He was energetic in behalf of the secularization of Clergy Reserves, and in the fight for religious equality. So strong was his opposition to clerical domination that he incurred the violent antipathy of the Roman Catholic body, and was regarded as the especial champion of Protestantism. He alienated the Conservatives of Lower Canada still further by his agitation for a reform of the representation, for to them the famous slogan "Representation by Population" meant the decline of French Canadian power in the Assembly.

Meanwhile, the political situation of United Canada grew more and more unstable. The interests of the two provinces were distinctly opposed, and deadlock threatened the administration. The leaders of the various factions vainly sought a solution of the coming crisis. Brown urged Representation by Population as the one way of escape, but Lower Canada led by Cartier, refused his solution. His persistent efforts to secure justice for his province embarrassed the successive ministers beyond endurance, and hastened the political deadlock which made Confederation inevitable.

In the actual scheme of Confederation, George Brown played an important part. As early as 1859 he had advocated a federal union of the Canadas to overcome the obstacles raised by the less flexible legislative union, but the ministry rejected his proposal. On June 14, 1864, as chairman of a committee appointed to consider the difficulties connected with the government, he recommended a federative system applied either to the Canadas alone or to all the British North American provinces. On the same day the ministry resigned and the long-threatened deadlock arrived. Brown was asked to join a proposed Coalition ministry pledged to evolve a workable form of government for Canada, and in spite of the strong distaste which a man of his decided temperament must have felt in uniting with Sir John A. Macdonald, his lifelong enemy, and Sir George Cartier, his political rival of Lower Canada, he consented for his country's sake. Immediately the Coalition Government set on foot Brown's federative scheme,

and he himself accelerated the movement with his customary impetuosity.

He was an impressive figure at the conferences held at Charlottetown and Quebec, and delivered many powerful speeches throughout the Provinces which carried conviction in their train. In the Assembly as well, he battered down arguments of the anti-unionists of whom his lifelong friend and co-worker, Antoine Dorion, was the leader. Finally, he represented Upper Canada at the Imperial conference held in London to frame the Confederation Act, and was foremost in the rejoicing over the success of the movement.

In 1867 he retired from the Assembly, and a few years later was appointed to the Senate, but except for his visit to Washington in 1873 in an unsuccessful attempt to renew the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, his name figured no more in great political measures. In March, 1880, he was shot at the *Globe* office by a former employee, and he died a few weeks later, mourned by the entire province.

To-day George Brown is remembered chiefly as a Father of Confederation, and the founder of *The Globe* but, great as these activities undoubtedly were, they claimed only a part of his unflagging vitality. He was actively concerned in every question relating to Canadian development, and supported with his many talents the cause of freedom in every branch of public life. Prison reform, temperance, the abolition of slavery in America, the development of the North West, education, farming—these and other reforms received a measure of his boundless

enthusiasm. His fiery disposition and ingrained obstinacy often antagonized his fellow-workers, but the rugged honesty, and large-souled generosity of the great Scotsman, easily atoned for his faults, and made the name of George Brown prominent among the list of Canadian patriots.

THE UNION OF THE BRITISH NORTH AMERICAN COLONIES

George Brown

From the debate in the Legislature, February 8th, 1865

THE scene presented by this chamber at this moment, I venture to affirm, has few parallels in history. One hundred years have passed away since these provinces became by conquest part of the British Empire. I speak in no boastful spirit—I desire not for a moment to excite a painful thought—what was then the fortune of war of the brave French nation, might have been ours on that well-fought field. I recall those olden times merely to mark the fact that here sit to-day the descendants of the victors and the vanquished in the fight of 1759, with all the differences of language, religion, civil law and social habit, nearly as distinctly marked as they were a century ago. Here we sit to-day seeking amicably to find a remedy for constitutional evils and injustice complained of—by the vanquished? No, but complained of by the conquerors! Here sit the representatives of the British population claiming justice—only justice; and here sit the representatives of the French population, discussing in the French tongue whether we shall have it. One hundred years have passed away since the conquest of Quebec, but here sit the children of the victor and the vanquished, all avowing hearty attachment to the British Crown—all earnestly deliberating how we shall best extend the blessings of British institutions—how a great people may be established on this continent in close and

hearty connection with Great Britain. Where, in the page of history, shall we find a parallel to this? Will it not stand as an imperishable monument to the generosity of British rule?

And it is not in Canada alone that this scene is being witnessed. Four other colonies are at this moment occupied as we are—declaring their hearty love for the parent state, and deliberating with us how they may best discharge the great duty entrusted to their hands, and give their aid in developing the teeming resources of these vast possessions. And well may the work we have unitedly proposed rouse the ambition and energy of every true man in British America. Look at the map of the continent of America, and mark that island (Newfoundland) commanding the mouth of the noble river that almost cuts our continent in twain. Well, that island is equal in extent to the kingdom of Portugal. Cross the straits to the mainland, and you touch the hospitable shores of Nova Scotia, a country quite as large as the kingdom of Greece. Then mark the sister province of New Brunswick—equal in extent to Denmark and Switzerland combined. Pass up the River St. Lawrence to Lower Canada—a country as large as France. Pass on to Upper Canada, twenty thousand square miles larger than Great Britain and Ireland put together. Cross over the continent to the shores of the Pacific, and you are in British Columbia, the land of golden promise—equal in extent to the Austrian Empire. I speak not now of the vast Indian territories that lie between—greater in extent than the whole soil of Russia—and that will ere long,

I trust, be opened up to civilization under the auspices of the British American confederation. Well, the bold scheme in your hands is nothing less than to gather all these countries into one—to organize them all under one government, with the protection of the British flag, and in heartiest sympathy and affection with our fellow-subjects in the land that gave us birth. Our scheme is to establish a government that will seek to turn the tide of European emigration into this northern half of the American continent—that will strive to develop its great natural resources—and that will endeavour to maintain liberty, and justice, and Christianity throughout the land.

The honourable member for North Hastings asks when all this can be done. The great end of this confederation may not be realized in the lifetime of many who now hear me. We imagine not that such a structure can be built in a month or in a year. What we propose now is but to lay the foundations of the structure—to set in motion the governmental machinery that will one day, we trust, extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific. And we take special credit to ourselves that the system we have devised, while admirably adapted to our present situation, is capable of gradual and efficient expansion in future years to meet all the great purposes contemplated by our scheme. But if the honourable gentleman will only call to mind that when the United States seceded from the mother country, and for many years afterwards, their population was not nearly equal to ours at this moment—that their internal improvements did not then approach to what we have already

attained, and that their trade and commerce was not then a third of what ours has already reached—I think that he will see that the fulfilment of our hopes may not be so very remote as at first sight might be imagined. And he will be strengthened in that conviction if he remembers that what we propose to do is to be done with the cordial sympathy and assistance of that great power of which it is our happiness to form a part.

Such are the objects of attainment to which the British American Conference pledged itself in October. And said I not rightly that such a scheme is well fitted to fire the ambition and rouse the energies of every member of this House? Does it not lift us above the petty politics of the past, and present to us high purposes and great interests that may well call forth all the intellectual ability and all the energy and enterprise to be found among us? I readily admit all the gravity of the question, and that it ought to be considered cautiously and thoroughly before adoption. Far be it from me to deprecate the closest criticism, or to doubt for a moment the sincerity or patriotism of those who feel it their duty to oppose the measure. But in considering a question on which hangs the future destiny of half a continent, ought not the spirit of mere fault-finding to be hushed?—ought not the voice of partisanship to be banished from our debates?—ought we not sit down and discuss the arguments presented in the earnest and candid spirit of men bound by the same interests, seeking a common end, and loving the same country? Some honourable gentlemen seem to imagine that the

members of government have a deeper interest in this scheme than others—but what possible interest can any of us have except that which we share with every citizen of the land? What risk does any one run from this measure in which all of us do not fully participate? What possible inducement could we have to urge this scheme, except our earnest and heartfelt conviction that it will inure to the solid and lasting advantage of our country?

THOMAS D'ARCY McGEE

THOMAS D'ARCY McGEE
1805-1868

THOMAS D'ARCY McGEE was born in 1805 in Carlingford—one of the most picturesque spots in Ireland. Gifted with a glowing imagination and an ardent nature—both intensified, no doubt, by his romantic surroundings—McGee possessed also the proverbial Celtic fluency of speech. This happy combination made him temperamentally fitted to arouse others emotionally when he appealed to them later in literature and in the legislature.

Emigrating to America he joined the Boston *Pilot*, and soon rose to the co-editorship of it. His articles were so clever that they attracted Daniel O'Connell's attention to their author, and led to an invitation to McGee to return to Ireland to give his services to the Dublin *Freeman*. The offer was accepted but it was not long before the youth found the limits put upon his ardour too circumscribed; so he left the *Freeman* and united with Duffy and the host of other brilliant young writers who thought to hasten right conditions for their country by a more expeditious means than O'Connell's slow but sure legislative measures. It was first of all a literary movement that these young Irelanders intended, and so they aimed to publish a library of patriotic books, of which McGee contributed two—"The Life of Art Mc-

Murrough" and "Irish writers of the Seventeenth Century." But before long, their indignation burst into flame when English law was perverted, for the purpose of imprisoning O'Connell in 1844. Then followed conditions so bad that the famine of 1848 fanned the flame to gigantic proportions, culminating in the Confederation scheme and finally in an uprising.

It was a foolish rebellion—evident from the first—and McGee felt this, but as secretary of the Confederation he was commissioned to play a certain perilous part, which he did satisfactorily. Of course the uprising was discovered, quelled, and the leaders exiled,—McGee escaping to the United States, where he again took up work on the *American Nation*. This he made an organ of anti-English feeling.

In 1857 he took the advice of some Canadian friends who assured him of the urgent need of an Irish leader in Montreal. Here he edited a paper which he called *The New Era*—prophetically named in view of the developments of 1867. In spite of his earlier political follies, but not without strenuous opposition in some quarters, in view of his rebel reputation, McGee was returned as one of the three representatives for Montreal in the Legislative House in 1858.

McGee's attitude towards England underwent a gradual change due to Canada's happy colonial connection with the Mother Country. In his *New Era* he suggested a union of the provinces which his statesmanlike mind saw would spell security for Canada, especially in view of possible effects of the American Civil War upon the country. In his

travels throughout what is now the Dominion of Canada he had seen the great possibilities for the united provinces, with a prospective railway to fuse them together, and so when in Parliament, Cartier, Macdonald, and the others were voicing the same opinion, in their advocacy of a federation, McGee went about the country making brilliant speeches on its advantages—speeches which, even now, charm the reader by their impassioned beauty and sincerity.

His generosity was almost limitless. It has been said that he delivered more than a thousand lectures during twenty years for charitable purposes; and that it is due to his exertions that night schools were established in New York.

Owing to McGee's denunciations of the Fenians who were stirring up strife in the New Dominion, one of them assassinated him in 1868 on his return home one night from the House of Parliament. His last speech—made that very evening—had embodied in it sentiments testifying to his nobility of soul; and his last letter which had not yet reached its destination was wending its way to Lord Mayo in Ireland, pleading for fuller rights for Ireland. That this letter led to the reforms which followed, we have Gladstone's own public statement.

The loss to Canada's literature by the untimely death of McGee cannot be measured, as with the prospect of release from political life he had hoped to give much time to writing, the character of which can be judged by the more than ordinary ability displayed in his histories, his speeches and his poetry, though these were written in the press of a busy life.

THE PRINCIPLE OF CONFEDERATION

Thomas D'Arcy McGee

Delivered before the Legislative Assembly, February, 9, 1865.

I trust the House will permit me to say a few words as to the principle of Confederation, considered in itself. In the application of this principle to former constitutions, there certainly always was one fatal defect, the weakness of the central authority. Of all the Federal constitutions I have ever heard or read of, this was the fatal malady: they were short-lived, they died of consumption. But I am not prepared to say that because the Tuscan League elected its chief magistrates but for two months and lasted a century, that therefore the Federal principle failed. On the contrary, there is something in the frequent, fond recurrence of mankind to this principle, among the freest people, in their best times and in their worst dangers, which leads me to believe, that it has a very deep hold in human nature itself—an excellent basis for a government to have. But, indeed, Sir, the main question is the due distribution of powers in a Federal Union—a question I dare not touch to-night. The principle itself seems to me to be capable of being so adapted as to promote internal peace and external security, and to call into action a genuine, enduring, and heroic patriotism. It is a principle capable of inspiring a noble ambition and a most salutary emulation. You have sent your young men to guard your frontier. You want a principle to guard your young men, and thus truly defend your frontier. For what do good men who make the best

soldiers fight? For a line of Scripture or chalk-line—for a text or for a pretext? What is a better boundary between nations than a parallel of latitude, or even a natural obstacle?—what really keeps nations intact and apart?—a principle. When I can hear our young men say as proudly, "our Federation," or "our Country," or, "our Kingdom," as the young men of other countries do, speaking of their own, then I shall have less apprehension for the result of whatever trials the future may have in store for us.

It has been said that the Federal Constitution of the United States has failed. I, Sir, have never said it. It may be a failure for us, paradoxical as this may seem, and yet not a failure for them. They have had eighty years' use of it, and having discovered its defects, may apply a remedy and go on with it eighty years longer. But we also were lookers-on, who saw its defects as the machine worked, and who have prepared contrivances by which it can be improved and kept in more perfect order when applied to ourselves. And one of the foremost statesmen in England, distinguished alike in politics and literature, has declared that we have combined the best part of the British and the American systems of government; an opinion deliberately formed at a distance, without prejudice, and expressed without interested motives of any description. We have, in relation to the head of the government, in relation to the judiciary, in relation to the second chamber of the Legislature, in relation to the financial responsibility of the General Government, and in relation to the public officials whose tenure of office is during good behaviour in-

stead of at the caprice of a party—in all these respects we have adopted the British system; in other respects we have learned something from the American system, and I trust and believe we have made a very tolerable combination of both.

The principle of Federation is a generous one. It is a principle that gives men local duties to discharge, and invests them at the same time with general supervision, that excites a healthy sense of responsibility and comprehension. It is a principle that has produced a wise and true spirit of statesmanship in all countries in which it has ever been applied. It is a principle eminently favourable to liberty, because local affairs are left to be dealt with by local bodies, and cannot be interfered with by those who have no local interest in them, while matters of a general character are left exclusively to a General Government. It is a principle inseparable from every government that ever gave extended and important services to a country, because all governments have been more or less confederations in their character. Spain was a Federation, for although it had a king reigning over the whole country, it had its local governments for the administration of local affairs. The British Isles are a quasi Confederation, and the old French dukedoms were confederated in the States-General. It is a principle that runs through all the history of civilization in one form or another, and exists alike in monarchies and democracies; and having adopted it as the principle of our future government, there were only the details to arrange and agree upon. Those details are before you. It

is not in our power to alter any of them even if the House desires it. If the House desires it can reject the treaty, but we cannot, nor can the other Provinces which took part in its negotiation, consent that it shall be altered in the slightest particular.

We stand at present in this position: we are bound in honour, we are bound in good faith, to four Provinces occupied by our fellow colonists, to carry out the measure of Union agreed upon here in the last week of October. We are bound to carry it to the foot of the Throne, and ask there from Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to direct legislation to be had on this subject. We go to the Imperial Government, the common arbiter of us all, in our true Federal metropolis—we go there to ask for our fundamental Charter. We hope, by having that Charter, which can only be amended by the authority that made it, that we will lay the basis of permanency for our future government. What I should like to see is—that fair representatives of the Canadian and Acadian aristocracy should be sent to the foot of the Throne with that scheme, to obtain for it the royal sanction—a scheme not suggested by others, or imposed upon us, but one the work of ourselves, the creation of our own intellect and of our own free, unbiassed, and untrammelled will. I should like to see our best men go there, and endeavour to have this measure carried through the Imperial Parliament—going into Her Majesty's presence, and by their manner, if not actually by their speech, saying—"During Your Majesty's reign we have had Responsible Government conceded

to us: we have administered it for nearly a quarter of a century, during which we have under it doubled our population, and more than quadrupled our trade. The small colonies which your ancestors could hardly see on the map, have grown into great communities. A great danger has arisen in our near neighbourhood. Over our homes a cloud hangs, dark and heavy. We do not know when it may burst. With our own strength we are not able to combat against the storm; but what we can do, we will do cheerfully and loyally. We want time to grow; we want more people to fill our country, more industrious families of men to develop our resources; we want to increase our prosperity; we want more extended trade and commerce; we want more land tilled—more men established through our wastes and wildernesses. We of the British North-American Provinces want to be joined together, that, if danger comes, we can support each other in the day of trial. We come to Your Majesty, who has given us liberty, to give us unity, that we may preserve and perpetuate our freedom; and whatsoever charter, in the wisdom of Your Majesty and of Your Parliament, you give us, we shall loyally obey and observe as long as it is the pleasure of Your Majesty and Your Successors to maintain the connection between Great Britain and these Colonies."

CHARLES TUPPER

CHARLES TUPPER

1821-1915

CONSPICUOUS in the annals of Canadian history is the name of Charles Tupper who for a half century employed his great talents and prodigious energy in the service of his country. He lived to see the nation which he had helped into existence justify its claim to nationhood on the battle ground of Europe, and in the development of its national consciousness himself played a major part.

Charles Tupper came of Puritan stock, and inherited the dauntless courage of his ancestors. He was born in Amherst, Nova Scotia, in 1821, and received his elementary education in the local schools. But ambition prompted him to enter the medical profession, and, despite great obstacles, he obtained his medical education at Edinburgh, returning to assume the arduous duties of a country physician for twelve years.

In 1855 Tupper entered politics, defeating the popular idol, Joseph Howe, in the Cumberland riding. His rise was phenomenal, for at the outset he was offered the leadership of the Conservative party by the aged leader, J. W. Johnstone, and though he refused the nominal headship, he performed the actual work. In Opposition he poured an unremitting stream of criticism on the heads of the

Government, and in 1863 when his party triumphed at the polls, he became Premier of Nova Scotia.

Almost at once he set on foot a scheme to unite the Maritime Provinces, for he had long been an advocate of union. His proposal for a conference to facilitate the movement for federation resulted in the Charlottetown Conference, which was followed by the decisive one at Quebec. At both of these conventions he was a prominent figure, and an impetuous disciple of Confederation.

To him was entrusted Nova Scotia's share in the common struggle, and his task was singularly difficult. Nova Scotia, led by Joseph Howe, was almost unanimous in its opposition to union. But Tupper, like Lloyd George, gloried in a fight, and with his usual bulldog courage threw himself into the thick of the battle, braving the wrath of his countrymen,—confident of the outcome.

He dodged an impending election, kept the minds of the legislators occupied with other issues, and secretly made his plans. In 1866 he secured a vote for a conference with the Imperial authorities on a scheme of union more favourable to Nova Scotia than the Quebec Resolutions. The following year Confederation came into being, and the indignation of Nova Scotia was revealed very clearly at the first Dominion election. Tupper was the only union candidate returned for Nova Scotia, and the old battle was renewed with unrelenting fury in the new Assembly. In the midst of it Howe slipped off to England to seek the repeal of the Confederation Act, and Tupper, following, faced him there. He

convinced him of the hopelessness of his mission, and urged his rival to join him in an attempt to convert Nova Scotia to union. At a great personal sacrifice Howe finally consented, and together they achieved the ultimate acceptance of the Confederation idea.

Tupper then applied his colossal energy to the task of national development. In 1870 he formulated the National Policy which was later adopted by the Conservative Party. He was invited to join the Dominion Cabinet, and became the moral support of Sir John A. Macdonald, defending him vigorously in the "Pacific Scandal" crisis, and persuading him to retain the leadership of his party, when the overwhelming criticisms, resulting from the Scandal, had sapped his self-confidence. During the second Macdonald administration, Tupper, in the capacity of Minister of Railways, initiated the policy pursued in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and by his unswerving faith in the wisdom of the undertaking helped to keep up the courage of the Government.

In 1884 Tupper disappeared from Canadian politics for a time, to accept the position of Canadian High Commissioner in England, but he responded to the urgent appeal of his party to accept the Premiership in 1896. He occupied the Premier's chair for a few weeks, at the end of which his party met with their long-threatened defeat, and he was driven into Opposition. He retained the leadership of the Conservatives until 1900, when he withdrew from public life, and spent the remainder of his days in England. He died in 1915, regretted

by a large circle of friends in England, and by the entire Canadian nation.

Sir Charles Tupper was a distinct contrast to his rival, Joseph Howe. His self-confident manner, pugnacity and deadly earnestness contrasted unfavourably with the subtle humour, delicacy and charm of his poetic countryman. But "the Cumberland war horse" caught and held the vision of a greater nationality when his more magnetic rival was groping in the dusk of provincialism, and to him is due, in great measure, the ultimate triumph of Confederation.

THE NECESSITY FOR UNION—A PLEA FOR NATIONALITY

CHARLES TUPPER

From a Speech on the Union of the Colonies, 1865

INSTEAD of looking to the Union of British North America as tending to weaken the bond of connection that binds us to the parent state, no one who reads the resolutions of the conference, but must see that there was placed in the forefront the principle that that bond should be strengthened, and that we should be connected with the parent state by a more indissoluble tie than ever before existed. I need not tell the House that these results have been submitted to the attention of the Imperial Government, and that the statesmen of England have looked upon them not as likely to separate these dependencies, but as the best means of uniting them more indissolubly to the crown.

I need not state that the same bond which exists between Canada and England—between Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and England, was determined upon when the scheme was contemplated that the Queen should place a Viceroy or Governor-General over these dependencies thus united, and the surest guarantee was given that the great object was to preserve the bonds that connect us with the parent state. And that view has been accepted not only by the government but by the people and press of England, and by statesmen in every quarter of the globe.

I have glanced at the more leading features connected with the constitution, and it will be perhaps

desirable that I show what necessity there existed, and what ground there was for having this union. I have already called the attention of the House to the singular fact that rife as party feeling has been in this country—that strong as have been the divisions and lines of demarcation between existing parties—from the time the great question of union was first submitted to the notice of the legislature and people of this country, there has been an amount of unanimity of sentiment among all classes of public men of all parties, such as has never been exhibited on any other question. It is not singular that such should be the case when we look at our present position. Who is there who does not feel that the first principle of manhood imprinted in the breast of man is that the country with which he is connected should occupy a position of influence of which he need not be ashamed? Who is there with a spark of manliness in his bosom who does not feel that he has a right to be proud of his country in proportion to the position it occupies in the scale of nations? I need not tell the House that surrounded as we are by many blessings—owing fealty as we do to the first empire in the world—enjoying the protection of one of the greatest powers on the globe—having free institutions in all their entirety—possessing as we do peace and plenty—that we enjoy advantages for which we ought to be profoundly grateful; but I can discover no other cause why there has been so great a co-operation among all classes of intelligent people of our country in respect to a union of these colonies than the desire that possessing these ad-

vantages we should at the same time advance to a more national position and render our institutions more secure. Who does not feel mortified when he takes up the report of the discussion that recently took place in the Commons, and finds that although the subject under debate was the security of British America, yet the only one of the provinces that appeared to be known to British statesmen—that was deemed worthy of their notice—was Canada?

We have had evidence of the most positive and tangible character, both in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, how insignificant is our position in the estimation of the parent state. What was the complaint when the Reciprocity Treaty was submitted to the House, that came from both sides? That the Imperial Parliament, in negotiating that treaty, had not thought it necessary to ask the opinion of Nova Scotian statesmen, although the great fisheries that surrounded this country were to be surrendered. Mr. Johnstone was invited by the Lieutenant-Governor, although in opposition at that time, to go in conjunction with Mr. Young to attend the meeting of delegates, for the purpose of considering the question. He found, however, that he was required to give his assent to what had been done already. Therefore, in the arrangement of a treaty so intimately affecting our interests, the views of not a single public man in Nova Scotia were considered worthy of attention, and I presume it was the same with New Brunswick.

Where was New Brunswick when a large slice was cut off from her territory, when the whole of

British North America was disfigured by the Ashburton Treaty? The opinion of a single statesman in New Brunswick was not asked.

The fact is, if we are known at all across the Atlantic, notwithstanding the immense resources of these Maritime Provinces, it is because we happen to be contiguous to Canada. Everything connected with our interests tells us of the insignificance of our position. Therefore it is not a matter of surprise, in view of these facts, and of the position we occupy, that the intelligent men of these Provinces have long since come to the conclusion that, if these comparatively small countries are to have any future whatever in connection with the crown of England, it must be found in a consolidation of all British North America. I regret that this harmony does not exist down to the present moment, but I am dealing with the position the question opened at the time these negotiations were going on.

GEORGES ETIENNE CARTIER

GEORGES ETIENNE CARTIER

1814-1873

GEORGES ETIENNE CARTIER, a descendant of the same family as the famous navigator, was destined to make the name twice famous in the annals of Canadian history. He was one of the ablest of French Canadian statesmen, supported by the British of his province as well as the French, and the chief influence in bringing Lower Canada into the Confederation in 1867.

Cartier was born in the village of St. Antoine, Quebec, on September 6, 1814. After the usual preliminary education, he began to practise law in Montreal in 1835, and by his tireless energy and industry quickly won prominence in his profession. He early became interested in politics and was naturally drawn into the rebellion of 1837. As a result he was obliged to live in seclusion for a time, and almost ten years elapsed before he again took any active part in public life.

He first entered parliament in 1848 and for the rest of his life was largely engaged in affairs of government. In 1858 he became joint-premier with Sir John A. Macdonald. Under their administration the first serious efforts were made toward a federal union and though they were defeated in the 1862 election, Cartier continued to speak and write un-

ceasingly and convincingly in favour of Confederation. Finally he succeeded against the strongest opposition in carrying the scheme through his own province. He took an active part in the conferences that drew up the British North America Act of 1867 and the following year was awarded a baronetcy for his services.

In the first Confederation Cabinet Cartier was Minister of Militia. Though he still remained Quebec's foremost leader, his political influence began to decline and in the elections of 1872 his own country failed to support him. A Manitoban constituency then returned him to parliament but he never recovered from the mortification of the defeat. He died the following year.

Though he lacked many of the qualities that characterized the finest of his contemporaries, he was unexcelled in energy, knowledge of parliamentary strategy, and ability in contest, and he was most faithful in devoting his powers to the political and material advancement of his native province.

THE UNION OF THE PROVINCES

Georges Etienne Cartier

From a speech delivered in 1865 in the Legislative Assembly

I DO not intend to enter into the details of the confederation project. I simply desire now to expose the principal reasons which should induce members to approve of the resolutions proposed by the Government. Confederation is, so to speak, a necessity for us at this time. It is impossible to close our eyes to what is happening on the other side of the line. We see that there a government established not more than eighty years ago has not been able to keep united the family of states which shares that vast country. We cannot hide from ourselves that the result of this terrible struggle, the progress of which we all follow with such anxiety, must affect our political existence. We do not know what the result will be—whether this great war will end by the establishment of two confederations or by the re-establishment of that which has already existed.

It is for us to act so that five colonies inhabited by people whose interests and sympathies are the same shall form a great nation. The way is for all to unite under a general government. The question reduces itself to this—we must either have a confederation of British North America or be absorbed by the American Union. Some are of the opinion that it is not necessary to form such a confederation to prevent our absorption by the neighbouring republic, but they are mistaken. We know that England is determined to aid us, to support us in any possible struggle against

our neighbours. The English provinces, separated as they are at present, cannot alone defend themselves. We have duties to fulfil towards England; if we desire to obtain her support for our defence, we must help ourselves, which we cannot very well do without a confederation. When we are united the enemy will know that if he attacks any province, either Prince Edward Island or Canada, he will have to deal with the combined forces of the Empire. Canada, remaining separate from the others, would be in a dangerous position if war was declared. When we have organized a system of defence, suitable for our mutual protection, England will not fail us in case of need, either in soldiers or in money. In territory, population and riches, Canada excels any of the other provinces, but it lacks an element essential to its national greatness—the maritime element. The trade of Canada is now so considerable that it is absolutely necessary to have means of communication with England at all seasons of the year. Twenty years ago the summer season was sufficient for the movement of our commerce, but now it is insufficient, and for our communication with the outside world during the winter we are at the mercy of our neighbours, through whose territory we are obliged to pass. In the situation in which we are at present a war with the United States will deprive us of our winter port.

The question to ask ourselves is this: Shall we live apart, will we be content to preserve a mere provincial existence when united we may become a great nation? No union of small communities ever was able to hope to reach national greatness with such

facility as we are. In past centuries warriors have struggled for long years to give to their country a strip of territory. In our own days Napoleon III, after an enormous expense of treasure and blood in the war with Italy, acquired Savoy and Nice, which added about a million people to France. If any one were to calculate the value of these acquisitions compared with what they cost, he would be struck with the disproportion and convinced that the territory acquired had perhaps been secured too dearly.

In British North America we are five different groups inhabiting five separate provinces. We have the same commercial interests and the same desire to live under the British Crown. Why should New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland retain their several customs tariffs against our trade, and why should we maintain similar duties to their disadvantage? In ancient times the manner in which nations developed was not the same as it is to-day. Then a weak settlement developed into a village, the village into a town or a city, which in turn became the nucleus of a nation. This is not the case in modern times. Nations now are formed by the joining together of various people having similar interests and sympathies. Such is our position at the present time. Objection is made to our project, because of the words "a new nationality." But if we unite we shall form a political nationality independent of the national origin and religion of individuals. Some have regretted that we have a distinction of races, and have expressed the hope that, in time, this diversity will disappear. The idea of a fusion of all

races is Utopian; it is an impossibility. Distinctions of this character will always exist; diversity is the order of the physical, moral and political world. As to the objection that we cannot form a great nation because Lower Canada is French and Catholic, Upper Canada English and Protestant, and the Maritime Provinces mixed, it is futile. Take for example the United Kingdom, inhabited as it is by three great races. Has the diversity of races been an obstacle to the progress and the welfare of Great Britain? Have not the three races, united by their combined qualities, their energy and their courage, contributed to the glory of the Empire, to its laws so wise, to its success on land, on sea and in commerce? In our confederation there will be Catholics and Protestants, English, French, Irish and Scotch, and each by its efforts and success will add to the prosperity of the Dominion, to the glory of the new confederation. We are of different races, not to quarrel, but to work together for the common welfare. We cannot by law make the differences of race disappear, but I am convinced that the Anglo-Canadians and the French-Canadians will appreciate the advantages of their position. Set side by side, like a great family, their contact will produce a happy spirit of emulation. The diversity of races will in fact, believe me, contribute to the common prosperity. The whole difficulty will be in the manner of rendering justice to minorities. In Upper Canada the Roman Catholics will be in the minority, in Lower Canada it will be the Protestants who will be in the minority, whilst in the Maritime Provinces the

two communions will equalize each other. Is it possible then to suppose that the general government or the provincial governments can become guilty of arbitrary acts? What would be the result, even supposing that one of the provincial governments should attempt it? Measures of such a character would undoubtedly be repudiated by the mass of the people. There is no reason then to fear that it will ever be sought to deprive a minority of its rights. Under the federal system, which leaves to the central government the control of questions of general interest, to which differences of races are foreign, the rights of race and of religion cannot be invaded. We shall have a general parliament to deal with questions of defence, tariff, excise, public works and all matters affecting individual interest. I will therefore ask those defenders of nationality who have accused me of bartering fifty-eight counties of Lower Canada with my colleague who sits near me (George Brown), how can injustice be done to the French-Canadians by the general government?

RICHARD JOHN CARTWRIGHT

RICHARD JOHN CARTWRIGHT

1835-1912

FOR practically a half century Sir Richard Cartwright dwelt in the forefront of politics. He saw the birth of a nation, saw it grow yearly in national consciousness—and died too early to behold its triumphant debût at the first Assembly of the League of Nations, held at Geneva in 1920.

Richard Cartwright was born in Kingston, in 1835. He came of loyal British stock, his grandfather, the Hon. Richard Cartwright, having been a United Empire Loyalist who later became very prominent in political and business circles in Canada.

He obtained his early education at Kingston, but received his university training at Trinity College, Dublin. After graduation he returned to Canada, and studied law, but, obeying the impulse to enter politics which had obsessed him from childhood, he was initiated into the secrets of political life in 1863, and devoted his energies to public service for the remainder of his life.

Cartwright was a firm believer in Confederation, and at the beginning of his career was a staunch supporter of Sir John A. Macdonald. Later he opposed his Chief on the question of banking reforms, and in 1872 his antipathy to the proposed Canadian

Pacific Railway Bill was so violent that he transferred his allegiance to the Liberal party.

In the general election of 1872, his popularity was demonstrated by his election as a Liberal member to Parliament for the same constituency for which he had formerly stood as a Conservative. After the downfall of Macdonald, subsequent to the "Pacific Scandal" disclosures, Cartwright became Minister of Finance in the Mackenzie Cabinet and during his five years of office was responsible for several important measures which tended to stabilize financial conditions in Canada.

The Mackenzie Government was defeated in 1878, and Sir John A. Macdonald came back to the helm on the wave of the National Policy. Sir Richard, in opposition, was merciless in his criticisms of the new protection scheme throughout the sixteen years of the Conservative regime, for he was a thoroughgoing free trader. Upon the election of Laurier to the Premiership in 1896, Cartwright was appointed Minister of Trade and Commerce, and secured several necessary reforms in trade relations, though his attempt to introduce unrestricted reciprocity with the United States was unsuccessful. In 1902 he was made a member of the Imperial Privy Council, and from 1904 until his death in 1912 was one of the Liberal leaders in the Senate.

Cartwright's pronounced ability and long years of experience entitled him to rank as a foremost authority on tariff and financial problems. As a public speaker and debater he was surpassed by few of his contemporaries. His annual oratorical duel, first

with Sir Charles Tupper, and later with Sir George Foster, was hailed with delight by parliamentary audiences, bored with the dull routine of ordinary procedure, and his speech in seconding the vote of thanks to the volunteers in the North West Rebellion of 1885, is regarded as a masterpiece of Canadian political oratory.

A COALITION GOVERNMENT IN THE FACE OF AN EMERGENCY

RICHARD CARTWRIGHT

From a speech delivered March 9, 1865, in the debates on Confederation

SO far from regarding the union of parties which has taken place as a political misfortune in itself, or as tending to deprive the people of any safeguard, I say that it was of the greatest importance to our people that they should be relieved, if only for a brief period, from the desperate party struggles in which they have been engaged—that a lull of some kind should be afforded, that they should have some opportunity of considering the grave dangers which encompass them, some chance of escaping from the state of practical anarchy into which they had been drifting. It is to their credit, Mr. Speaker, and to the credit of those who control the press of this country, that ever since this project has been fairly before us a very marked improvement has taken place in the whole tone and temper of public discussion. Of the press, in particular, I must say that the moment they were relieved of the necessity of supporting party manœuvres—the moment a subject of sufficient importance was submitted for consideration, they seem to have risen at once to the level of the subject and to have abandoned all those unhappy and rancorous personalities which, in times past, were too apt to disfigure their pages.

Sir, I believe the people of Canada have learned a lesson which they will not easily forget. I believe

that henceforward it will not be found so easy to array citizen against citizen, race against race, as it has been heretofore. I believe that our people have discovered that men who rise to be the heads of great parties are not of necessity villains and scoundrels—that both sides may have great political principles to maintain—that the words Reformer and Revolutionist, Conservative and Corruptionist, are not absolutely convertible terms, and that men who have given up the best of their lives, and sacrificed too often, the best part of their fortunes in the service of their country, have had some better and higher reasons than mere love of jobbery and intrigue for doing so. To me, Sir, this appears a matter of great moment. It is only too notorious how much of the misery and misfortune which has befallen the United States, is to be traced to the systematic degradation of their public men. It is well for us that the matter is still in our own power. It is well for us that we have still the choice whether we will have statesmen or stump orators to rule over us—whether this House shall maintain its honourable position as the representatives of a free people, or whether it shall sink into a mere mob of delegates, the nominees of caucuses and of wire-pullers. It is still in our power to decide whether we shall secure a fair share of the best talent we possess to carry on the affairs of the country, or whether we will ostracize from our councils every man of superior ability, education or intelligence—with what practical results we need not look far abroad to see; and, I think, Sir, it is fast becoming apparent that in this, as in other matters,

the people of Canada are well disposed to adhere to the traditions of their British ancestry.

There is one objection, Mr. Speaker, which has been advanced perpetually throughout this debate by some honourable gentlemen who, while unable or unwilling to show any valid reason against Confederation in itself, profess themselves bitterly scandalized at the political combination by which it is likely to be brought about. Now, Sir, I admit at once that there is a prejudice, a just and wholesome prejudice, against all coalitions in the abstract. I admit that that prejudice is especially strong in the minds of Englishmen, and that, in point of fact, a coalition is always an extreme measure, only to be had resort to in cases of extreme emergency. A coalition, Mr. Speaker, may be a very base act, but it may also be a very noble one. It may be a mere conspiracy, for purposes of revenge or plunder, on the part of men hating and detesting each other to the uttermost—or it may be an honourable sacrifice of private personal enmity before the pressure of overwhelming public necessities, to escape from great danger or to carry a great object.

Sir, I shall not insult the intelligence of the House by inquiring whether this present existing Coalition has proposed to itself an object of sufficient importance to warrant its formation. Even those who censure the details of this scheme most strongly are fain to do homage to the grandeur of the project, and are compelled to admit that a union which should raise this country from the position of a mere province to that of a distinct nation, is a project well worthy

of the utmost efforts of our statesmen. To determine the remaining question whether the position of our affairs was so critical as to require the utmost energy of all our leaders, and to justify any union which gave a reasonable hope of extricating ourselves from our difficulties, I must again revert to the condition in which we found ourselves during the last few years, and I ask every honourable member to answer for himself whether it was one which it gives him any pleasure to look back upon?

Was it pleasant for us, Mr. Speaker, a young country without one penny of debt which has not been incurred for purposes of public utility—was it pleasant for us, I ask, to find our revenue yearly outrunning our expenditure in the ratio of 20, 30 or even 40 per cent. per annum? Was it pleasant for us to know that some of our once busiest and most prosperous cities were being depopulated under the pressure of exorbitant taxation? Was it pleasant for us, inhabiting a country able to sustain ten times its present population, to find capital and immigrants alike fleeing from our shores, even if they had to take refuge in a land desolated by civil war? Was it pleasant for us, Sir, the only colony of England which has ever vindicated its attachment to the Empire in fair fight, to know that our apathy and negligence in taking steps for our own defence was fast making us the byword to both friend and foe? And lastly, Mr. Speaker, I ask was it pleasant for us, needing and knowing that we needed a strong government above all things, one which should maintain a firm and steady policy, and possess the good will and support

of at least a large majority of our people—I say, Sir, was it pleasant for us at such a crisis to find ourselves the victims of a mere political see-saw—to be sure only of this one fact, that whatever course of policy was adopted, the circumstance that it emanated from one party would cause it to be viewed with jealousy and suspicion by the whole remaining moiety of the nation?

I would not have it thought, Mr. Speaker, that in saying this I am blind to the difficulties with which our statesmen have had to struggle. So far from this I believe that it has been quite too much the fashion to underrate them in times past. We have spoken of them as if it were the easiest task in the world to blend together, in less than one generation, two distinct peoples—peoples differing from one another in race, in language, in laws, customs and religion—in one word, in almost every point in which it is possible for men of European origin, and professing one common Christianity, to differ from each other. Sir, this could never have been an easy task. It is one which has again and again baffled the ablest statesmen of the most powerful monarchies of Europe; and I will not undertake to say whether it is ever capable of complete accomplishment. Be that as it may, I know that in every empire which has ever existed, from the English to the Roman, which has held different races under its sway, it has always been found necessary to make large allowances for distinctive national traits—has, in fact, been found necessary to introduce in some measure, the Federal element, though it is equally true that in every state

which deserved the name of an empire, the supreme authority of the central power in all that concerns the general welfare has been acknowledged unreservedly.

And, Sir, it is just because this seems to have been effectual in all essential points in the scheme now before us—because, while reserving to the general government the power of the purse and the sword, it accords the amplest defensive powers to the various local bodies—because, even where there may be some conflict of jurisdiction on minor matters, every reasonable precaution seems to have been taken against leaving behind us any reversionary legacies of sovereign state rights to stir up strife and discord among our children. For all these reasons, I say, I am disposed to give my hearty support to the scheme as a whole, without criticizing too narrowly the innumerable details which it must inevitably present to attack.

ANTOINE AIME DORION

ANTOINE AIME DORION

1818-1891

THE character of Antoine Dorion lends a touch of poetry to the story of Confederation. Judged by political standards of success his public life was a pathetic failure, for during a political career of twenty years he held but seldom the reins of office, and it was his misfortune to oppose a movement which was destined to become the greatest force in the history of Canadian development. But no one who reads of the sweetness and magnetism of Dorion's personality can pronounce his career a failure. Not only does it adorn the somewhat sordid annals of politics with a rare beauty and charm, but in the inspiration which it gave to later politicians, notably Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who worshipped at the shrine of Dorion, its fruitfulness is proven beyond fear of denial.

Dorion came of a noted family of French Canadian public men, his father, grandfather and brother having each in turn been members of the Assembly. He was born at St. Anne de la Perade, Champlain County, in 1818, was educated at Nicolet College, and in 1842 was called to the Bar. His rise to distinction was rapid, for the charm of his personality augmented the prestige which his natural ability won for him, and he was soon recognized as a potential leader of Quebec.

In 1850 the Parti Rouge was founded by Papineau and other brilliant Radicals, animated with the fervour and rash idealism of youth. Dorion became an active member of the party, and in 1854, on the retirement of Papineau, was chosen leader of the Rouges. In the same year he entered the Assembly, together with nineteen others of his party, and for a time the influence of the Parti Rouge was dominant in Quebec. Dorion allied himself with George Brown, the leader of the Clear Grits in Upper Canada, and a warm friendship sprang up between the two leaders, which the combined differences of temperament, race and religion could not destroy.

In 1858 Brown invited Dorion to join him in an administration pledged to seek a solution for the ills of government which were crippling the development of the country. Dorion accepted, but Sir Edmund Head, who distrusted the Liberals, refused a dissolution of the House, and the Brown-Dorion government lasted but two days. Brown was an eager disciple of Representation by Population, and Dorion agreed to a modification of the measure, with checks attached which would safeguard the rights of the Lower Canadians. As an alternative he proposed a loose federation of the two provinces. But in the succeeding administrations neither of the suggestions was adopted, and though Dorion held office for a short time under two different administrations his efforts were futile to shelve the approaching crisis, and the famous deadlock took place in 1864.

When the actual scheme of Confederation was evolved, Dorion distrusted the measure and set his

face against it like flint. He was wholly conscientious in his opposition, for though he approved of the principle of Confederation he believed that the scheme was premature, and deplored the terms of the union. He refused to join a Coalition government which espoused the movement, and for the first time in the history of their friendship became alienated from George Brown. Both in and out of the Assembly he criticized the measure and exerted a great deal of influence over his young compatriots in Quebec, but the movement was triumphant in spite of his earnest opposition.

After Confederation Dorion became a vigilant critic of the new government, and was relentless in his attitude to the Pacific Scandal. When the Mackenzie government came into power Dorion was appointed Minister of Justice, but poverty and ill health forced him to abandon politics, and in 1874 he accepted the position of Chief Justice of Quebec, which he held until his death in May, 1891.

Antoine Dorion was a gentleman of the old school, —courteous, polished and dignified. Yet with all his aristocracy of bearing he was thoroughly democratic in his principles. In his youth he was radical to the extreme, but age modified his views and he became ultimately the founder of the Liberal party of Quebec which under Laurier rose to a position of distinction throughout the country. But Dorion's heart was in his profession, and he never craved the spoils of office nor the adulation of the crowd. His love for his country was far-reaching, and in his quiet and self-effacing way he served her nobly.

His lack of vision at the crisis in Canadian history was the tragic point in his career, but there is a heroism in his honest opposition to Confederation more poignant than the reckless courage of George Brown and John A. Macdonald who both rode triumphant over obstacles at which he faltered. His attitude toward union may have lessened his fame as a politician, but nothing can sully his reputation as a magnanimous and single-minded patriot of Canada.

THE WEAKNESS OF THE CONFEDERATION SCHEME

ANTOINE DORION

From a speech in the Legislative Assembly, Feb. 16, 1865

THIS scheme is submitted to us on two grounds; first, the necessity for meeting the constitutional difficulties which have arisen between Upper and Lower Canada, owing to the growing demands on the part of Upper Canada for representation by population; and, secondly, the necessity of providing more efficient means for the defence of the country than now exist. These are the only two grounds we have heard stated for the propositions now submitted to us; and I shall apply myself to explain my views on these two subjects, and also upon the scheme generally. When upon the first question I trust I shall be permitted to go a little into the history of the agitation for representation by population, for I owe it to myself, to my constituents and the country. My name has been used in various ways. It has sometimes been said that I was entirely favourable to representation by population—at other times that I was entirely favourable to the Confederation of the provinces, and I shall now endeavour, once more, to state as clearly as possible what my real views have been, and still are.

The first time representation by population was mooted in this House, on behalf of Upper Canada, was, I believe, in the Session of 1852, when the Conservative party took it up, and the Hon. Sir Allan Macnab moved resolutions in favour of the prin-

ciple. We then found the Conservatives arrayed in support of this constitutional change. It had been mooted before on behalf of Lower Canada, but the Upper Canadians had all opposed it. In 1854 the Macnab-Morin coalition took place and we heard no more of representation by population from that quarter—that is, as mooted by the Conservative party, who from that time forth uniformly opposed it on every occasion. It was, however, taken up by the present Hon. President of the Council, the member for South Oxford, and with the energy and vigour that he brings to bear on every question that he takes in hand, he caused such an agitation in its behalf as almost threatened a revolution. As the agitation in the country increased, so did the vote for it in this House increase, and on several occasions I expressed my views upon the subject. I never shirked the question—I never hesitated to say that something ought to be done to meet the just claims of Upper Canada, and that representation based on population was in the abstract a just and correct principle. I held, at the same time, that there were reasons why Lower Canada could not grant it; and I entreated Lower Canadian representatives to show themselves disposed to meet the views of Upper Canada by making, at any rate, a counter proposal; and in 1856, when Parliament was sitting in Toronto, I, for the first time, suggested that one means of getting over the difficulty would be to substitute for the present Legislative union a Confederation of the two Canadas, by means of which all local questions could be consigned to the deliberations of local

legislatures, with a central government having control of commercial and other questions of common or general interest. I stated that considering the different religious faith, the different language, the different laws that prevailed in the two sections of the country, this was the best way to meet the difficulty; to leave to a general government questions of trade, banking, public works of a general character, etc., and to commit to the decision of local legislatures all matters of a local bearing. At the same time I stated that, if these views should not prevail, I would certainly go for representation by population, and such checks and guarantees as would secure the interests of each section of the country, and to preserve to Lower Canada its cherished institutions.

Well, Sir, I have not a word of all this to take back. I still hold to the same views. I still think that a Federal union of Canada might hereafter extend so as to embrace other territories either east or west; that such a system is well adapted to admit of territorial expansion without any disturbance of the federal economy, but I cannot understand how this plain sentence should be considered by the President of the Council, as any indication that I have ever been in favour of Confederation with the other British Provinces. There is nothing I have ever said or written that can be construed to mean that I was ever in favour of such a proposition. On the contrary, whenever the question came up I set my face against it. I asserted that such a union could only bring trouble and embarrassment, that there was no social, no commercial connection between the

provinces whose union was proposed,—nothing to justify their union at the present juncture. Of course I do not say that I shall be opposed to their Confederation for all time to come. Population may extend over the wilderness that now lies between the Maritime Provinces and ourselves, and commercial intercourse may increase sufficiently to render Confederation desirable. But I say here, as I said in 1856, and in 1861 also, that I am opposed to this Confederation now.

Sir, I may be asked what difference our bringing in the Maritime Provinces can make. This I shall endeavour to explain. When they went into the Conference, the honourable gentlemen opposite submitted to have the votes taken by provinces. Well, they have brought us in, as was natural under the circumstances, the most conservative measure ever laid before a Parliament. The members of the Upper House are no longer to be elected, but nominated. Were we not expressly told that it was the Lower Provinces who would not hear of our having an elective Legislative Council? If instead of going into the Conference with the people of the Lower Provinces, our Government had done what they pledged themselves to do, that is, to prepare a Constitution themselves, they would never have dared to bring in such a proposition as this which is now imposed upon us by the Lower Colonies,—to have a Legislative Council, with a fixed number of members, nominated by four Conservative governments.

If the two Canadas were alone interested, the majority would have its own way—would look into

the Constitution closely—would scan its every doubtful provision, and such a proposal as this about the Legislative Council would have no chance of being carried, for it is not long since the House, by an overwhelming majority, voted for the substitution of an elected for a nominated Upper Chamber. In fact, the nominated Chamber had fallen so low in public estimation—I do not say it was the fault of the men who were in it, but the fact is nevertheless, as I state it—that it commanded no influence. There was even a difficulty of getting a quorum of it together. So a change became absolutely necessary, and up to the present moment the new system worked well; the elected members are equal in every respect to the nominated ones, and it is just when we see an interest beginning to be felt in the proceedings of the Upper House that its Constitution is to be changed, to return back again to the one so recently condemned. Back again, did I say? No, sir, a Constitution is to be substituted, much worse than the old one, and such as is nowhere else to be found. Why, even the British House of Lords, conservative as it is, is not altogether beyond the influence of the popular sentiment of the country. Their number may be increased on the recommendation of the responsible advisers of the Crown, if required to secure united action or to prevent a conflict between the two Houses. From the position its members occupy, it is a sort of compromise between the popular element and the influence or control of the Crown.

But the new House for the Confederation is to be

a perfectly independent body—these gentlemen are to be named for life—and there is to be no power to increase their number. How long will the system work without producing a collision between the two branches of the Legislature? Suppose the Lower House turns out to be chiefly Liberal, how long will it submit to the Upper House, named by Conservative administrations which have taken advantage of their temporary numerical strength to bring about such a change as is now proposed? Remember, sir, that after all, the power, the influence of the popular branch of the Legislature is paramount. We have seen constitutions like that of England adopted in many countries, and where there existed a nobility, such as in France in 1830, the second chamber was selected from this nobility. In Belgium, where the Constitution is almost a fac-simile of that of England, but where there are no aristocracy, they adopted the elective principle for the Upper House, and no where in the world is there a fixed number for it, unless it is also elective.

It must be fresh in the memory of a great many members of this House how long the House of Lords resisted the popular demand for reform, and what great difficulties were threatened. At last in 1832 the agitation had become so great that the Government determined to nominate a sufficient number of peers to secure the passage of the Reform Bill. The members of the House had to choose between allowing the measure to become law, or to see their influence destroyed by the addition of an indefinite number of members. They preferred the first alternative, and

thereby quieted an excitement, which, if not checked in time, might have created a revolution in England. The influence of the Crown was then exerted in accordance with the views of the people; but here we are to have no such power existing to check the action of the Upper Chamber, and no change can be made in its composition except as death might remove its members. I venture to prophesy, sir, that before a very short time has elapsed a dead-lock may arise, and such an excitement be created as has never yet been seen in this country.

JOSEPH HOWE

JOSEPH HOWE

1804-1873

FROM the little province of Nova Scotia many of Canada's greatest sons have sprung, but none of these later constellations can dim the lustre which surrounds the name of Joseph Howe. Apart from his vast political service to his province—for to him is due the lion's share in the establishment of Responsible Government in Nova Scotia—his personal charm, magnetic eloquence and mighty intellect alone, accord him first place in the hearts of his countrymen.

He was born in Halifax in 1804, of United Empire stock, and after a childhood characterized by fun and mischief, with glintings of the poetic nature which afterwards found expression in charming verse, he became printer's devil to the Halifax *Gazette* at the age of thirteen. During his boyhood he devoured the classics, and with such a background his natural gift for writing rapidly expanded, so that at the age of twenty-four he felt qualified to assume the editorship of the *Nova Scotian*.

By 1830 the political situation in Nova Scotia was precarious, and Howe instituted a vigorous campaign against the autocracy of the government, through the pages of his journal. He was indicted for libel in 1835 for attacking the City Magistrates, and spoke

in his own defence, having studied law books for a week. Contrary to the expectations of a sympathetic populace, he was acquitted, and from that day forward he became the idol of his countrymen, and the champion of their rights.

In 1836 Howe was elected to the Legislature. The "Family Compact" of Nova Scotia was flourishing, and Howe never ceased to strike at it, both in the House and in his newspaper. His peerless eloquence and nimble wit made him the terror of his opponents, and his strong hold on the people outside fortified his position in the Assembly. A reform agitation was in progress, simultaneously, in the Canadas, and Howe sympathized warmly with their effort, but his ingrained loyalty to Great Britain led him to decline their invitation to join them in the appeal to arms. He refused "to bully the British Government," and the wisdom of his course was proven when in 1847 the hostile faction surrendered and Nova Scotia was granted Responsible Government, a year earlier than the Canadas.

He had early conceived a desire for the federation of the British provinces, and to further his scheme, secured the offer of an Imperial guarantee to build an intercolonial railway. He negotiated with the Canadas for their share in the great project, and his ardent imagination flamed with the latent possibilities of the plan, when, unfortunately, Lord Grey limited the guarantee, wet-blanketed the scheme, and wounded Howe's sensibilities to the core.

From this date Howe's attitude to federation underwent a severe change, and when Charles Tupper pro-

posed and secured a conference at Charlottetown (at which Howe was not present) to consider the advantages of Confederation, he opposed it with his whole strength. The people of Nova Scotia, themselves, heartily resisted the plan, and Howe became their spokesman. He maintained that the rights and the individuality of Nova Scotia would be swamped in the interests of the larger provinces, and threw himself bitterly into the anti-union cause.

But, thanks to Tupper, Confederation carried in Nova Scotia, after a three-year struggle, and though Howe went to England to seek its repeal, his efforts were unavailing. Sir John Macdonald convinced him of the futility of his task, and persuaded him to reconcile his countrymen to Confederation, and to accept a seat in the Cabinet of the new Dominion. He accepted reluctantly and, broken-hearted, sought to quell the agitation against union. Together with Tupper he accomplished his task, though at the expense of his popularity in the province.

In April, 1873, he was appointed Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia, but he lived only a few weeks after the appointment, worn out as he was with worry and disappointment. He was buried in Halifax, near the home of his boyhood, and at his death, recollections of his kindness, geniality and charm swarmed back into the memory of his former admirers and reinstated him in his position as a popular idol and the pride of Nova Scotia—a position which he will hold for time immemorial.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

Hon. Joseph Howe

From an address in Detroit, in July, 1865

I NEVER prayed for the gift of eloquence till now. Although I have passed through a long public life, I never was called upon to discuss a question so important in the presence of a body of representative men so large. I see before me merchants who think in millions and whose daily transactions would sweep the harvest of a Greek island or a Russian principality. I see before me the men who whiten the ocean and the great lakes with the sails of commerce—who own the railroads, canals and telegraphs which spread life and civilization through this great country, making the waste plains fertile and the wilderness to blossom as the rose. I see before me the men whose capital and financial skill bulwark and sustain the Government in every crisis of public affairs. On either hand I see the gentlemen who control and animate the press, whose laborious vigils mould public sentiment—whose honourable ambitions I can estimate from my early connection with the profession. On these benches, Sir, or I mistake the intelligence to be read in their faces, sit those who will yet be governors and ministers of State. I may well feel awed in the presence of such an audience as this; but the great question which brings us together is worthy of the audience and challenges their grave consideration.

What is that question? Sir, we are here to deter-

mine how best we can draw together in the bonds of peace, friendship and commercial prosperity the great branches of the British family. In the presence of this great theme all petty interests should stand rebuked—we are not dealing with the concerns of a city, a province, or a state, but with the future of our race in all time to come. Some reference has been made to "elevators" in your discussions. What we want is an elevator to lift our souls to the height of this great argument. Why should not these three great branches of the family flourish, under different systems of government, it may be, but forming one grand whole, proud of a common origin and of their advanced civilization? We are taught to reverence the mystery of the Trinity, and our salvation depends on our belief. The clover lifts its trefoil leaves to the evening dew, yet they draw their nourishment from a single stem. Thus distinct, and yet united, let us live and flourish.

Why should we not? For nearly two thousand years we were one family. Our fathers fought side by side at Hastings, and heard the curfew toll. They fought in the same ranks for the sepulchre of our Saviour—in the earlier and later civil wars. We can wear our white and red roses without a blush, and glory in the principles those conflicts established. Our common ancestors won the Great Charter and the Bill of Rights—established free Parliaments, the Habeas Corpus and trial by jury. Our jurisprudence comes down from Coke and Mansfield to Marshall and Story, rich in knowledge and experience which no man can divide. From Chaucer to Shakespeare

our literature is a common inheritance. Tennyson and Longfellow write in one language which is enriched by the genius developed on either side of the Atlantic. In the great navigators, from Cotterel to Hudson, and in all their "moving accidents by flood and field," we have a common interest. On this side of the sea we have been largely reinforced by the Germans and French, but there is strength in both elements. The Germans gave to us the sovereigns who established our freedom, and they give to you industry, intelligence and thrift; and the French, who have distinguished themselves in arts and arms for centuries, now strengthen the Provinces which the fortune of war decided they could not control.

But it may be said we have been divided by two wars. What then? The noble St. Lawrence is split in two places—by Goat Island and by Anticosti —but it comes to us from the same springs in the same mountain sides; its waters sweep together past the pictured rocks of Lake Superior, and encircle in their loving embrace the shores of Huron and Michigan. They are divided at Niagara Falls as we were at the revolutionary war, but they come together again on the peaceful bosom of Ontario. Again they are divided on their passage to the sea; but who thinks of divisions when they lift the keels of commerce, or, when drawn up to heaven they form the rainbow or the cloud? It is true that in eighty-five years we have had two wars—but what then? Since the last we have had fifty years of peace, and there have been more people killed in a single campaign in the late civil war, than there were in the

two national wars between this country and Great Britain. You hope to draw together the two conflicting elements and make them one people. And in that task I wish you God speed! And in the same way I feel that we ought to rule out everything disagreeable in the recollection of our old wars, and unite together as one people for all time to come. I see around the door the flags of the two countries. United as they are there, I would ever have them draped together, fold within fold—and let

"Their varying tints unite,
And form in Heaven's light
One arch of peace."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD

THE RELATIONSHIP OF CANADA TO GREAT BRITAIN

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD

From a Speech made in the House of Commons, May 8, 1872

IT has been said by the honourable gentleman on my left (Mr. Howe), in his speech to the Young Men's Christian Association, that England had sacrificed the interests of Canada. If England has sacrificed the interests of Canada, what sacrifice has she not made in the cause of peace. Has she not, for the sake of peace between those two great nations, rendered herself liable, leaving out all indirect claims, to pay millions out of her own treasury? Has she not made all this sacrifice, which only Englishmen and English statesmen can know, for the sake of peace—and for whose sake has she made it? Has she not made it principally for the sake of Canada? Let Canada be severed from England—let England not be responsible to us, and for us, and what could the United States do to England? Let England withdraw herself into her shell, and what can the United States do? England has got the supremacy of the sea, she is impregnable in every point but one, and that point is Canada; and if England does call upon us to make a financial sacrifice, does find it for the good of the Empire that we, England's first colony, should sacrifice something, I say that we would be

unworthy of our proud position if we were not prepared to do so. I hope to live to see the day, and if I do not that my son may be spared to see Canada the right arm of England, to see Canada a powerful auxiliary to the Empire, not, as now, a cause of anxiety and a source of danger. And I think that if we are worthy to hold that position as the right arm of England, we should not object to a sacrifice of this kind when so great an object is attained, and the object is a great and lasting one.

It is said that amities between nations cannot be perpetual. But I say that this Treaty which has gone through so many difficulties and dangers, if it is carried into effect, removes almost all possibility of war. If ever there was an irritating cause of war, it was from the occurrences arising out of the escape of those vessels, and when we see the United States people and government forget this irritation, forget those occurrences, and submit such a question to arbitration, to the arbitration of a disinterested tribunal, they have established a principle which can never be forgotten in this world. No future question is ever likely to arise that will cause such irritation as the escape of the Alabama did, and if they could be got to agree to leave such a matter to the peaceful arbitrament of a friendly power, what future cause of quarrel can in the imagination of man occur that will not bear the same pacific solution that is sought for in this? I believe that this Treaty is an epoch in the history of civilization, that it will set an example to the wide world that must be followed; and with the growth of the great Anglo-

Saxon family, and with the development of that mighty nation to the south of us, I believe that the principle of arbitration will be advocated and adopted as the sole principle of settlement of differences between the English-speaking peoples and that it will have a moral influence in the world. And, although it may be opposed to the antecedents of other nations, that great moral principle which has now been established among the Anglo-Saxon family will spread itself over all the civilized world. It is not too much to say that it is a great advance in the history of mankind, and I should be sorry if it were recorded that it was stopped for a moment by a selfish consideration of the interests of Canada.

EDWARD BLAKE

EDWARD BLAKE

1833-1912

EDWARD BLAKE was the son of William Hume Blake, a noted lawyer and politician of Upper Canada, and descendant of the Blakes of Galway, famous in history and romance. He was born in Middlesex county in 1833, but when he was a few months old the family moved to Toronto. He entered Upper Canada College at the age of eleven years, but, though he possessed an intellect far above the average, he showed no inclination to study. In 1848, however, his father took him on a tour abroad, and the vivid impressions which he received of revolutionary Europe, gave him a burning zeal for knowledge. From that date he studied assiduously, and obtained first place in the final examinations. In 1854 he graduated from the University of Toronto, with high honours in Classics, and began the study of law. He was called to the bar in 1857, and during his career won a brilliant reputation in his profession not only in Canada, but in England and the outlying posts of the Empire, as well.

His political life began in 1867, when he was elected both to the Provincial and the Federal Parliament. In 1869 he accepted the leadership of the Liberal party in Ontario, and in 1871, on the resignation of the Sandfield-Macdonald ministry, became Premier

of Ontario. Unfortunately his health became impaired at this juncture, and he was obliged to resign the Premiership in 1872.

He was returned to the Dominion Parliament in 1872, and was urged to accept the leadership of the Liberal party in the Federal House, but declined. He accepted a place in the Mackenzie Cabinet in 1873, and became Minister of Justice in 1875. Again ill health forced his resignation although during his term of office he was chiefly instrumental in perfecting the constitution of the Supreme Court at its establishment by the Mackenzie administration.

After the downfall of the Mackenzie Government in 1878, Blake accepted the leadership of the Liberal Party, and although he was never a popular leader, his magnificent intellectual gifts and his moral integrity commanded the respect of his party. He was a champion of Canadian autonomy, and was one of the leaders of the "Canada First" party. During his regime as leader of the Opposition he kept a vigilant watch on the actions of the Government, particularly with regard to the North-west Rebellion and the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In 1887 he retired from political life in Canada to the deep regret of his followers, and was succeeded by Wilfrid Laurier as Liberal leader.

In 1892 he accepted an invitation to represent an Irish constituency in the British House of Commons, and was elected with a large majority, for South Longford. He became an earnest supporter of Home Rule and the rights of the Irish, and made many striking speeches on their behalf. He was elected a

member of the Executive Committee of the Irish Parliamentary party in 1894 and was included in the Royal Commission appointed to investigate the financial situation between Great Britain and Ireland.

In 1896 he was one of the members of the Imperial Parliament selected to investigate the causes of the Transvaal Raid in Africa, and served also as an arbitrator between the Government of New Zealand and the New Zealand Midland Railway. He continued his activities in the Imperial Parliament until 1907, when increased ill-health forced him to retire from political life. He returned to Toronto, where he died in 1912.

Edward Blake's genuine interest in education was evinced throughout his career. In 1873 he was appointed Chancellor of the University of Toronto, and his liberality, when in this position, is well-known.

As a citizen his name ranks among the greatest that Canada has produced—as a politician, his title is dubious. While possessing one of the mightiest intellects ever recorded in the annals of the Dominion Parliament, his over-strong individuality and his lack of personal magnetism, deprived him of the warm-hearted devotion which was bestowed on Sir John Macdonald and Sir Wilfrid Laurier. But, for his uprightness, his benevolence and his unusual oratorical and intellectual ability—he lives in the memory of his countrymen, as one of the most noble and distinguished of Canadian public men.

Builders of the Canadian Commonwealth

CANADA'S RELATION TO THE EMPIRE

Hon. Edward Blake

Delivered at Aurora, 1874.

LET me turn to another question which has been adverted to on several occasions, as one looming in the not very distant future. I refer to the relations of Canada to the Empire. Upon this topic I took, three or four years ago, an opportunity of speaking, and ventured to suggest that an effort should be made to reorganize the Empire upon a Federal basis. I repeat what I then said, that the time may be at hand when the people of Canada shall be called upon to discuss the question. Matters cannot drift much longer as they have drifted hitherto. The Treaty of Washington produced a very profound impression throughout this country. It produced a feeling that at no distant period the people of Canada would desire that they should have some greater share of control than they now have in the management of foreign affairs; that our Government should not present the anomaly which it now presents—a Government the freest, perhaps the most democratic in the world with reference to local and domestic matters, in which you rule yourselves as fully as any people in the world, while in your foreign affairs, your relations with other countries, whether peaceful or warlike, commercial or financial, or otherwise, you may have no more voice than the people of Japan. This, however, is a state of things of which you have no right to complain, because so long as you do not choose to undertake the responsibilities and burdens which

attach to some share of control in these affairs, you cannot fully claim the rights and privileges of free-born Britons in such matters.

But how long is this talk in the newspapers and elsewhere, this talk which I find in very high places, of the desirability, aye, of the necessity of fostering a national spirit among the people of Canada, to be mere talk? It is impossible to foster a national spirit unless you have national interests to attend to, or among people who do not choose to undertake the responsibilities and to devote themselves to the duties to which national attributes belong. We have been invited by Mr. Gladstone and other English statesmen, notably by Mr. Gladstone, in the House of Commons, very shortly before his Government fell, to come forward. Mr. Gladstone, speaking as Prime Minister of England, expressed the hope he cherished, that the Colonies would some day come forward and express their readiness and desire to accept their full share in the privileges and responsibilities of Britons. It is for us to determine—not now, not this year, not perhaps during this Parliamentary term, but yet, at no distant day—what our line shall be. For my part I believe that while it is not unnatural, not unreasonable, pending that process of development which has been going on in our new and sparsely settled country, that we should have been quite willing—we so few in numbers, so busied in our local concerns, so engaged in subduing the earth and settling up the country—to leave the cares and privileges to which I have referred in the hands of the parent State; the time will come when

that national spirit which has been spoken of will be truly felt among us, when we shall realize that we are four millions of Britons who are not free, when we shall be ready to take up that freedom, and to ask what the late Prime Minister of England assured us we should not be denied—our share of national rights.

To-morrow, by the policy of England, in which you have no voice or control, this country might be plunged into the horrors of a war. It is but the other day that, without your knowledge or consent, the navigation of the St. Lawrence was ceded forever to the United States. That is a state of things of which you may have no right to complain, as long as you can choose to say: "We prefer to avoid the cares, the expenses and charges, and we are unequal in point of ability to discharge the duties which appertain to us as free-born Britons;" but while you say this, you may not yet assume the lofty air, or speak in the high-pitched tones which belong to a people wholly free.

The future of Canada, I believe, depends very largely upon the cultivation of a national spirit. We are engaged in a very difficult task—the task of welding together seven Provinces which have been accustomed to regard themselves as isolated from each other, which are full of petty jealousies, their provincial questions, their local interests. How are we to accomplish our work? How are we to effect a real union between these Provinces? Can we do it by giving a sop now to one, now to another, after the manner of the late Government? By giving

British Columbia the extravagant terms which have been referred to; by giving New Brunswick $150,000 a year for an export duty which cannot be made out as worth more than $65,000 a year? Do you hope to create or to preserve harmony and good feeling upon such a false and sordid and mercenary basis as that? Not so! That day I hope is done for ever, and we must find some other and truer ground for Union than that by which the late Government sought to buy love and purchase peace. We must find some common ground on which to unite, some common aspiration to be shared, and I think it can be found alone in the cultivation of that national spirit to which I have referred.

I observe that those who say a word on this subject are generally struck at by the cry that they are practically advocating annexation. I believe that the feeling in the neighbouring Republic has materially changed on this subject, and that the notions which were widely spread there some years ago, and the desire to possess, as one Republic, under one Government, the whole of this continent, from north to south, have died away. A better and a wiser spirit, I believe, now prevails—largely due, perhaps, to the struggles which are unhappily occurring in that country. The attempt to reorganize the South has been going on for some years, and owing, I think, to a very great error in judgment as to the way in which it should be effected, it has been largely a failure. There is great difficulty, and there are frequent disorders in the South. Then there are the conflicts of interest between the Eastern and Western

States, very great conflicts and heartburnings. Then there are the alarming difficulties and complications arising from the inordinate political power which has been grasped by great corporations. And I think that the best and wisest minds in the United States have settled down to the conviction that the management of the United States with its present territory is just as difficult a task as their best men can accomplish, and that it would not be wise to add to their existing complications and difficulties by any such unwieldy accession or unmanageable increase as this great domain, the larger half of the whole continent, would be. I think that among those circles in the United States which are to be looked to as influencing the future, there is a great modification of view on this point, and there would be, even were we disposed, as I hope we shall never be disposed, to offer to join them, a great reluctance to take us.

But I believe we have a future of our own here. My opinion coincides with those to which I have been referring in the United States. I believe that that country is even larger than it ought to be in order to be well governed, and that an extension of its territory would be very unfortunate in the interests of civilization. "Cribbed, cabined and confined" as we ourselves are to the South by the unfortunate acts of English diplomatists in the past, giving up to the United States territory which, if we had it to-day, would make our future absolutely assured, but still retaining as we do the great North-west, I believe we can show that there is room and verge enough in North America for the maintenance of two distinct

governments, and that there is nothing to be said in favour but on the contrary everything to be said against, the notion of annexation. These are the material reasons, independent altogether of the very strong and justly adverse feeling arising from our affection for and our association with England, and the well settled conviction which, I believe, exists among the people of this country that a constitutional monarchy is preferable to a republican government. The monarchical government of England is a truer application of real Republican principles than that of the United States, and I have no hesitation in saying that the government of Canada is far in advance, in the application of real republican principles, of the Government of either England or the United States.

But, with the very great advantages which we enjoy over that portion of our fellow-subjects living in England, by reason of our having come into a new country, having settled it for ourselves, and adapted our institutions to modern notions by reason of our not being cumbered by the constitution of a legislative chamber on the hereditary principle, by reason of our not being cumbered with an aristocracy, or with the unfortunate principle of primogeniture and the aggregation of the land in very few hands, by reason of our not being cumbered with the difficulties which must always exist where a community is composed of classes differing from one another in worldly circumstances so widely as the classes in England differ, where you can go into one street of the City of London and find the extreme of

wealth, and a mile or two away the very extreme of poverty; living, as we do, in a country where these difficulties do not exist, where we early freed ourselves from the incubus of a State Church, where we early provided for the educational needs of our people, under these happy circumstances, with these great privileges, there are corresponding responsibilities.

WILFRID LAURIER

WILFRID LAURIER

1841-1919

THE elevation of a French Canadian to the Premiership of Canada was a subtle testimony to the success of Confederation. The honours heaped upon this French Canadian premier at the Diamond Jubilee of 1897 were a striking demonstration of the tremendous stride which Canada had made politically during the first sixty years of Victoria's sovereignty. And no more fitting representative of Canada's best, or one more worthy to receive the highest honours of a nation, could have been selected than Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the brilliant, broad-minded and courtly statesman of French Canadian birth.

Wilfrid Laurier was born at St. Lin, Quebec, in 1841, and received his primary education at the Parish School, but was sent at an early age to the Protestant school at New Glasgow to acquire a knowledge of English. Later he took the Classical course at L'Assomption College; still later he undertook the study of law at Laval University, and in 1864 was admitted to the Bar.

At a very early age he obtained a profound influence over his fellow students, and many prophecies were made concerning his future. His marked intellectual ascendency, strength of character, and personal charm were in evidence when he was but a

child. As he grew to manhood his natural gifts developed, and the rich background he had formed from constant reading of the best in both English and French literature gave him a breadth of view and a mental balance which fitted him admirably for the part he was destined to play in Canadian political life.

In 1871 he entered the Quebec Legislature as Liberal member for Arthabaska, and was quickly recognized as the future leader of the Quebec Liberals. His eloquence, philosophic outlook, and lofty intellect won the admiration and confidence of a large following throughout his province, and in 1874 he was elected to the Dominion Legislature.

A bitter conflict had been brewing in Quebec between the Catholic clergy and the Liberals, and Laurier took his stand boldly against clerical control of politics and education. He was himself a Catholic, but had been an enthusiastic member of L'Institut Canadien, a club devoted to intellectual freedom, and his wide reading combined with his youthful experience in the Protestant community of New Glasgow gave him a love of religious toleration, which characterized his whole political career. In 1877 during the height of the quarrel between church and state he delivered a powerful speech on Political Liberalism which sharply defined the position of his party toward the Catholic clergy—and won him the concentrated hostility of the ecclesiastical body, as well as the far-reaching admiration of broad-minded Catholics and Protestants alike.

In the same year he entered the Mackenzie Administration as Minister of Inland Revenue, but the

ministry was forced to resign in the following year and he had no opportunity to display his ability as an administrator. His reputation was steadily increasing however, and when in 1887 Edward Blake, Mackenzie's successor, resigned, Laurier was chosen as Liberal leader of the House of Commons. The few speeches which he had delivered had given him a prestige which few members in the House enjoyed, and in spite of his French origin, and the racial troubles which divided the country, he received the full confidence of his party throughout the country.

In 1896 the Conservative Government resigned on the Manitoba Separate School question, and Laurier became premier of Canada. He remained at the helm for a period of fourteen years, and attempted to put into practice the beliefs which he had held since boyhood. He steadily upheld the principle of federalism, and of civil and religious freedom, and was moderate and rationalistic in his views. His attitude to Imperialism was especially noteworthy, for though his enthusiasm for the Empire was stimulated by the pageantry and glory of the Diamond Jubilee in England, he strove faithfully to maintain Canada's autonomy within the Empire, and resisted the strong movement for Imperial Federation which swept over England in the early part of the century.

In 1911 he was defeated on the proposed bill for Reciprocity with the United States, but retained the leadership of the Liberal party. During the war he lost his grip on his party by his attitude toward conscription. He favoured Canada's participation in

the war, but, out-and-out advocate of freedom that he was, opposed enforced enlistment. As a result he was placed in an uncomfortable position, for pro-conscriptionist Liberals deserted him, and the Nationalists under Bourassa slipped out of his grasp. His declining years were spent under trying circumstances, as, struggling against ill health and war conditions, he strove pathetically to regain his former place in the affections of his people. He succeeded shortly before his death in 1919, and when he at last laid down the sceptre, all Canada, and many in Europe as well, mourned the loss of the statesman, courtier and scholar who had made such a profound impression on the public life of his day.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier's fascinating personality has left an indelible stamp on the memory of his countrymen, but admiration for his personal charms should not cloud the significance of his political achievements. His master diplomacy preserved Canadian autonomy at a critical period and paved the way for Canada's new conception of nationhood. But above all he deserves lasting gratitude in that he a Frenchman and a Catholic swept aside the barrier of ecclesiastical control of politics, and placed the welfare of the Dominion of Canada before sect, creed, or race.

POLITICAL LIBERALISM

Wilfrid Laurier

Speech delivered before the Club Canadien, Quebec, June, 1877.

NOW, it should not be overlooked that our form of government is a representative monarchy. This is the instrument which throws into relief and brings into action the two principles, Liberal and Conservative. We Liberals are often accused of being Republicans. I do not note this reproach for the purpose of taking it up, for it is not worth taking up. I merely state that the form matters little; whether it be monarchical or republican, the moment the people exercise the right to vote, the moment they have a responsible government, they have the full measure of liberty. Still, liberty would soon be no more than an empty name, if it left without control those who have the direction of power. A man, whose astonishing sagacity has formulated the axioms of governmental science with undeviating accuracy, Junius, has said: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Yes, if a people want to remain free, they must, like Argus, have a hundred eyes and be always on the alert. If they slumber, or relax, each moment of indolence loses them a particle of their rights. Eternal vigilance is the price which they have to pay for the priceless boon of liberty. Now, the form of a representative monarchy lends itself marvellously—much more, perhaps, than the republican form—to the exercise of this necessary vigilance. On the one hand, you have those who govern and, on the other, those who watch. On

the one hand you have those who are in power and have an interest in remaining there, and, on the other, those who have an interest in getting there. What is the bond of cohesion to unite each individual of the different groups? What is the principle, the sentiment, to range these divers elements of the population either among those who govern or those who watch? It is the Liberal principle or the Conservative principle. You will see together those who are attracted by the charm of novelty and you will see together those who are attracted by the charm of habit. You will see together those who are attached to all that is ancient and you will see together those who are always disposed to reform.

Now, I ask, between these two ideas which constitute the basis of parties, can there be a moral difference? Is the one radically good and the other radically bad? Is it not evident that both are what are termed in moral philosophy "indifferents," that is to say that both are susceptible of being appreciated, pondered and chosen? Would it not be as unfair as it would be absurd to condemn or approve either the one or the other as absolutely bad or good?

Both are susceptible of much good, as they are also of much evil. The Conservative, who defends his country's old institutions, may do much good, as he also may do much evil, if he be obstinate in maintaining abuses, which have become intolerable. The Liberal, who contends against these abuses, and who, after long efforts, succeeds in extirpating them, may be a public benefactor, just as the Liberal who lays a rash hand on hallowed institutions may be a

scourge not only for his country, but for humanity at large.

The constitution of the country rests on the freely expressed wish of each elector. It intends that each elector shall cast his vote freely and willingly as he deems best. If the greatest number of the electors of a country are actually of an opinion and that, owing to the influence exercised upon them by one or more men or owing to words they have heard or writings they have read, their opinion changes,there is nothing in the circumstance but what is perfectly legitimate. Although the opinion they express is different from the one they would have expressed without such intervention, still it is the one they desire to express conscientiously, and the constitution meets with its entire application. If, however, notwithstanding all reasoning, the opinion of the electors remains the same, but that, by intimidation or fraud they are forced to vote differently, the opinion which they express is not their opinion, and the constitution is violated. As I have already said, the constitution intends that each one's opinion shall be freely expressed as he understands it at the moment of expression, and the collective reunion of the individual opinions, freely expressed, forms the government of the country.

The law watches with so jealous an eye the free expression of the elector's opinion as it really is, that, if in a constituency the opinion expressed by a single one of the electors is not his real opinion, but an opinion forced upon him by fear, fraud or corruption the election must be annulled.

It is therefore perfectly legitimate to alter the elector's opinion by argument and all other means of persuasion, but never by intimidation. As a matter of fact, persuasion changes the elector's conviction; intimidation does not. When, by persuasion, you have changed the elector's conviction, the opinion he expresses is his own opinion, but when, by terror, you force him to vote, the opinion he expresses is your opinion; remove the cause of his fear and he will then express another opinion, which is his own.

Now, it will be understood, if the opinion expressed by the majority of the electors is not their real opinion, but an opinion snatched from them by fraud, by threats or by corruption, the constitution is violated and you have not the government of the majority, but the government of a minority. Well, if such a state of things continues and is repeated,—if, after each election, the will expressed is not the real will of the country,—once more you do violence to the constitution, responsible government is no longer anything but an empty name, and, sooner or later, here as elsewhere, the pressure will culminate in explosion, violence and ruin.

GEORGE M. GRANT

GEORGE M. GRANT

1835-1902

GEORGE MUNRO GRANT was a native Canadian. He was born at Albion Mines, Nova Scotia, December 22, 1835, of Scottish parentage. The simple life of his early years on the farm gave him two of his outstanding characteristics—practical ability and a deep love of nature. He was a very vivacious lad and enjoyed his share of boyhood pranks.

His school days were spent at Pictou Academy and West River Seminary where he showed promise of a brilliant career. At the age of eighteen he went to Glasgow University. Here he entered into every activity of college life, winning laurels in scholastic, debating, and athletic circles.

In 1860 he was ordained to the Ministry of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. After short pastorates in River John and Prince Edward Island he was called to St. Matthew's Church, Halifax, of which he was the eminently successful minister for fourteen years.

A momentous era was dawning in Canada. The proposal of a confederation of the provinces was before the people. In Nova Scotia there was strong opposition to the scheme, but it had a powerful champion in Grant. He did much to foster and

strengthen faith in the new Dominion. In 1872 he accompanied Sanford Fleming, engineer-in-chief of the Canadian Pacific Railway on a surveying tour through the then unknown West. On his return he published an account of his travels in the book "From Ocean to Ocean" which revealed to Canadians the glories of their Northern and Western territories.

But it was in a wider sphere that Dr. Grant found his true life work. In 1877 he accepted the principalship of Queen's University, Kingston, and as the beloved Principal Grant of Queen's he touched thousands of young lives, inspiring them towards a pursuit of knowledge, the upbuilding of a free, self-reliant personality, and high ideals of Canadian citizenship. Early and late he toiled for Queen's; his boundless energy and enthusiasm built up a great institution of learning.

Not only as a college president was Dr. Grant of note. As a public man he watched the trend of events in Canadian national life and spoke out sanely and fearlessly on questions of the day.

Principal Grant never spared himself. As preacher, writer, lecturer, and student of affairs he had many interests and responsibilities which greatly taxed his strength. His sudden death came as a great shock to the whole country, for he had been carrying out his duties at the University a few days before the end. He passed away May 10, 1902, and was laid to rest in beautiful Cataraqui Cemetery, Kingston. Canada mourned the loss of one of her truest and greatest sons.

CANADA FIRST

Principal George M. Grant

From an address to the Canadian Club of New York City, 1887.

I MAY be asked: How can Canada have at the same time the position of a nation and a colony? I may answer that no country any more than an individual attains to complete self-realization at once; but, until it does so it is allowed a place among the nations only by courtesy. As I have already hinted, the War of Independence was made much more difficult than it otherwise would have been, from the fact that each of the thirteen colonies thought itself supreme and the Union secondary. Even that war for bare life did not teach the lesson that a real Union was necessary to constitute a great State. It took some years of deadlocks before the present constitution was adopted. We know how weak the bond that held the States together was felt to be—for a long time even after that. We see it in the action of State Legislatures in 1812-15, justifying Great Britain and Canada, threatening secession and refusing quotas of troops; from subsequent attempts at nullification North and South; from political compromises and conflicts at various times; and, at last, from the great war of Secession, when thousands of men like Lee and Jackson, who cared nothing for slavery, fought for it rather than fight against their own native State. It took nearly a century for the great Republic to realize itself, to understand that its life was a sacred thing, and that whosoever or whatsoever stood in the way or interfered with its legitimate

development must be swept out of the way. It accomplished the necessary task—consequently its present proud position. It stands out before the world a power so mighty that we can hardly conceive of a force, internal or external, great enough to threaten it.

Well, Canada stands now about where the United States stood a century ago. The circumstances are different, for though history repeats itself, it does not do so slavishly. We have had a different historical development. We have more radical racial diversities. We have a less genial climate and larger breadths of land of which nothing can be made. But we are near where the Republic stood a century ago. Canada is in its infancy and must expect infantile troubles. It must go through the hard experience of measles, teething, calf-fears and calf-love; must be expected to spend its pocket-money foolishly, suffer from explosions of temper, get slights that are hard to bear and abrasions of the skin that will make it think life not worth living. But, it is a big, healthy child, comes of a good stock, has an enormously large farm, which is somewhat in need of fencing and cultivation, and I think it may be depended on to pull through. It is growing up under stern conditions, and, as a Scotch-Canadian, taught in his youth to revere Solomon and to believe therefore in the efficacy of the rod and the yoke for children, I am inclined to think that it is none the worse for that. The climate is most trying to tramps. Geography and treaties have united to make its material unification difficult. Much of its property

is not worth stealing; but all the more will it hold on with grim tenacity to all that is worth anything.

But, no matter what may be said in its disparagement, it is a wide and goodly land, with manifold beauties of its own, with boundless resources that are only beginning to be developed, and with room and verge for Empire. Each Province has attractions for its children. One would need to live in it to understand how strong these attractions are. Only when you live among the country people do they reveal themselves. Strangers or tourists are not likely to have the faintest conception of their deepest feelings. Thus a man who lives in his study, or in a select coterie, or always in a city, may—no matter how great his ability—utterly misconceive the spirit of a province or nation and the vigour of its life. It has been my lot to live for a time in almost every one of our provinces, and to cross the whole Dominion, again and again, from ocean to ocean, by steamer or canoe, by rail and buck-board, on horse back and on foot, and I have found, in the remotest settlements, a remarkable acquaintance with public questions and much soundness of judgment and feeling in regard to them; a high average purity of individual and family life, and a steady growth of national sentiment. I have sat with the blackened toilers in the coal mines of Pictou and Cape Breton, the darkness made visible by the little lamps hanging from their sooty foreheads; have worshipped with pious Highlanders in log huts in fertile glens and on the hillsides, where the forest gives place slowly to the plough, and preached to assembled thousands,

seated on grassy hillocks and prostrate trees; have fished and sailed with the hardy mariners, who find "every harbour, from Sable to Canseau, a home;" have ridden under the willows of Evangeline's country, and gazed from North and South Mountain on a sea of apple-blossoms; have talked with gold miners, fishermen, farmers, merchants, students, and have learned to respect my fellow countrymen and to sympathize with their provincial life, and to see that it was not antagonistic, but intended to be the handmaid to a true national life.

Go there, not altogether in the spirit of "Baddeck, and that sort of thing." Pass from Annapolis Royal into the Bay of Fundy, and then canoe up the rivers, shaded by the great trees of New Brunswick. Live a while with the habitants of Quebec, admire their industry, frugality and courtesy; hear their carols and songs, that blend the forgotten music of Normandy and Brittany with the music of Canadian woods; music and song, as well as language and religion, rooting in them devotion to "Our Language, our Laws, our Institutions." Live in historic Quebec, and experience the hospitality of Montreal. Pass through the Province of Ontario, itself possessing the resources of a kingdom. Sail on lakes great enough to be called seas, along rugged Laurentian coasts, or take the new Northwest passage by land, that the Canadian Pacific has opened up from the Upper Ottawa, through a thousand miles once declared impracticable for railways, and now yielding treasures of wood and copper and silver, till you come to that great prairie ocean, that sea of green and gold in

this month of May, whose billows extend for nigh another thousand miles to the Rocky Mountains, out of which great Provinces like Minnesota and Dakota will be carved in the immediate future. And when you have reached the Pacific, and look back over all the panorama that unrolls itself before your mental vision, you will not doubt that the country is destined to have a future. You will thank God that you belong to a generation to whom the duty has been assigned of laying its foundations; and knowing that the solidity of any construction is in proportion to the faith, the virtue and the self-sacrifice that has been wrought into the foundation, you will pray that you for one may not be found wanting.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD

CANADA'S RELATIONSHIP TO GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES

Sir John A. Macdonald

From the last address to the people of Canada and in connection with the Unrestricted Reciprocity Campaign of 1891

FOR a century and a half this country has grown and flourished under the protecting aegis of the British Crown. The gallant race who first bore to our shores the blessings of civilization passed by an easy transition from French to British rule, and now form one of the most law-abiding portions of the community. These pioneers were speedily reinforced by the advent of a loyal band of British subjects, who gave up everything that most men prize, and were content to begin life anew in the wilderness rather than forego allegiance to their Sovereign. To the descendants of these men, and of the multitude of Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen who emigrated to Canada, that they might build up new homes without ceasing to be British subjects, to you Canadians I appeal, and I ask you what have you to gain by surrendering that which your fathers held most dear? Under the broad folds of the Union Jack, we enjoy the most ample liberty to govern ourselves as we please, and at the same time we participate in the advantages which flow from association with the mightiest Empire the world has ever seen. Not only are we free to manage our domestic concerns, but, practically, we possess the privilege of making

our own treaties with foreign countries, and, in our relations with the outside world, we enjoy the prestige inspired by a consciousness of the fact that behind us towers the majesty of England.

The question which you will shortly be called upon to determine resolves itself into this: shall we endanger our possession of the great heritage bequeathed to us by our fathers, and submit ourselves to direct taxation for the privilege of having our tariff fixed at Washington, with a prospect of ultimately becoming a portion of the American Union? I commend these issues to your determination, and to the judgment of the whole people of Canada, with an unclouded confidence that you will proclaim to the world your resolve to show yourselves not unworthy of the proud distinction that you enjoy, of being numbered among the most dutiful and loyal subjects of our beloved Queen.

As for myself, my course is clear. A British subject I was born—a British subject I will die. With my utmost effort, with my latest breath, will I oppose the "veiled treason" which attempts by sordid means and mercenary proffers to lure our people from their allegiance. During my long public service of nearly half a century, I have been true to my country and its best interests, and I appeal with equal confidence to the men who have trusted me in the past, and to the young hope of the country, with whom rests its destinies for the future, to give me their united and strenuous aid in this, my last effort, for the unity of the Empire and the preservation of our commercial and political freedom.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER

DEATH OF SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD

Sir Wilfrid Laurier

From a Speech in the House of Commons, June 8, 1891

SIR JOHN MACDONALD now belongs to the ages, and it can be said with certainty that the career which has just been closed is one of the most remarkable careers of this century. It would be premature at this time to attempt to fix or anticipate what will be the final judgment of history upon him; but there were in his career and in his life, features so prominent and so conspicuous that already they shine with a glow which time cannot alter, which even now appear before the eye as such they will appear to the end in history. I think it can be asserted that for the supreme art of governing men, Sir John Macdonald was gifted as few men in any land or in any age were gifted; gifted with the most high of all qualities which would have made him famous wherever exercised and which would have shone all the more conspicuously the larger the theatre. The fact that he could congregate together elements the most heterogeneous and blend them into one compact party, and to the end of his life keep them steadily under his hand, is perhaps altogether unprecedented. The fact that during all those years he retained unimpaired not only the confidence, but the devotion—the ardent devotion

and affection of his party—is evidence that beside those higher qualities of statesmanship to which we were the daily witnesses, he was also endowed with those inner, subtle, undefinable graces of soul which win and keep the hearts of men.

As to his statesmanship, it is written in the history of Canada. It may be said without any exaggeration whatever, that the life of Sir John Macdonald, from the date he entered Parliament, is the history of Canada, for he was connected and associated with all the events, all the facts which brought Canada from the position Canada then occupied—the position of two small provinces, having nothing in common but a common allegiance, united by a bond of paper, and united by nothing else—to the present state of development which Canada has reached. Although my political views compel me to say that, in my judgment, his actions were not always the best that could have been taken in the interest of Canada, although my conscience compels me to say that of late he has imputed to his opponents motives as to which I must say in my heart he has misconceived, yet I am only too glad here to sink these differences, and to remember only the great services he has performed for our country—to remember that his actions always displayed great originality of views, unbounded fertility of resources, a high level of intellectual conceptions, and, above all, a far-reaching vision beyond the event of the day, and still higher, permeating the whole, a broad patriotism, a devotion to Canada's welfare, Canada's advancement and Canada's glory.

The life of a statesman is always an arduous one, and very often it is an ungrateful one. More often than otherwise his actions do not mature until he is in his grave. Not so, however, in the case of Sir John Macdonald. His career has been a singularly fortunate one. His reverses were few and of short duration. He was fond of power, and, in my judgment, if I may say so, that may be the turning point of the judgment of history. He was fond of power, and he never made any secret of it. Many times we have heard him avow it on the floor of this Parliament, and his ambition in this respect was gratified as, perhaps, no other man's ambition ever was. In my judgment, even the career of William Pitt can hardly compare with that of Sir John Macdonald in this respect; for although William Pitt, moving in a higher sphere, had to deal with problems greater than our problems, yet I doubt if in the intricate management of a party William Pitt had to contend with difficulties equal to those that Sir John Macdonald had to contend with. In his death, too, he seems to have been singularly happy. Twenty years ago I was told by one who at that time was a close personal and political friend of Sir John Macdonald, that in the intimacy of his domestic circle he was fond of repeating that his end would be as the end of Lord Chatham, that he would be carried away from the floor of Parliament to die. How true that vision into the future was we now know, for we saw him to the last, with enfeebled health and declining strength, struggling on the floor of Parliament until the hand of fate pinned him to his bed to die. And thus to die

with his armour on was probably his ambition. Sir, death is the law—the supreme law. Although we see it every day in every form, although session after session we have seen it in this Parliament striking right and left without any discrimination as to age or station, yet the ever-recurring spectacle does not in any way remove the bitterness of the sting. Death always carries with it an incredible sense of pain; but the one thing sad in death is that which is involved in the word separation—separation from all we love in life. This is what makes death so poignant when it strikes a man of intellect in middle age. But when death is the natural termination of a full life, in which he who disappears has given the full measure of his capacity, has performed everything required of him, and more, the sadness of death is not for him who goes, but for those who loved him and remain. In this sense I am sure the Canadian people will extend unbounded sympathy to the friends of Sir John Macdonald—to his sorrowing children, and, above all, to the brave and noble woman, his companion in life and his chief helpmate.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, one after another, we see those who have been instrumental in bringing Canada to its present stage of development removed from amongst us. To-day we deplore the loss of him who, we all unite in saying, was the foremost Canadian of his time, and who filled the largest place in Canadian history. Only last week was buried in the city of Montreal, another son of Canada, one who at one time had been a tower of strength to the Liberal party, one who will ever be remembered as one of the

noblest, purest and greatest characters that Canada has ever produced, Sir Antoine Aimé Dorion. Sir Antoine Aimé Dorion had not been in favour of Confederation. Not that he was opposed to the principle; but he believed that the Union of these provinces, at that day, was premature. When, however, Confederation had become a fact, he gave the best of his mind and heart to make it a success. It may indeed happen, Sir, that when the Canadian people see the ranks thus gradually reduced and thinned of those upon whom they have been in the habit of relying for guidance, that a feeling of apprehension will creep into the heart lest, perhaps, the institutions of Canada may be imperilled. Before the grave of him who, above all, was the father of Confederation, let not grief be barren grief; but let grief be coupled with the resolution, the determination, that the work in which Liberals and Conservatives, in which Brown and Macdonald united, shall not perish, but that though United Canada may be deprived of the services of her greatest men, still Canada shall and will live.

GEORGE W. ROSS

GEORGE W. ROSS

1841-1914

SIR GEORGE ROSS is held in grateful remembrance by the people of Ontario for his generous contribution to the development of the province. But he was not a merely provincial figure, and Canada, too, owes him thanks for his faithful political service in the Dominion Parliament, extending over a period of eighteen years.

George Ross began life in a humble way on a farm in Middlesex county, in 1841, was educated at the local public school, and at Toronto Normal School, and entered upon his public career at the age of fifteen years as a country school teacher. His natural gift for public speaking and debating, and his capacity for leadership were quickly recognized and he was persuaded to enter politics. With a political goal in view he became in turn journalist, Public School and Model School Inspector, and by 1872 his prestige was sufficient to effect his election to the Dominion Legislature as Liberal Member for Middlesex County. Once inside the parliamentary walls, his rise was steady, though by no means spectacular.

In 1883 he joined the Mowat Administration in Ontario as Minister of Education, and his work in this capacity was of lasting benefit to the education system of the province, several badly-needed reforms

having been achieved. His efforts were rewarded with the Premiership in 1899, which he retained until 1905, when the Liberal party went down to defeat after an uninterrupted reign of thirty-three years.

During his term of administration Ontario's economic development was facilitated greatly by the construction of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, which opened up the vast treasures of Northern Ontario to the world. Ross was energetic in behalf of the scheme, and hoped to extend the railway eventually to Hudson Bay. Throughout his premiership he continued his educational reforms, and was active in advancing Temperance reform.

In 1907 he was appointed to the Senate and became one of the Liberal leaders, but he was not slavishly attached to his party and retained his individual view point to the end. Thus, though a life-long Liberal, he opposed the Reciprocity Bill of 1911, because it conflicted with his Imperialistic principles. He died in 1914, active to the last in the service of his country.

Sir George Ross was a staunch Imperialist and an enthusiastic student of the Empire in its various phases. He was an author and publicist of repute, and has left behind him a number of books and treatises on education, history and politics. He was, besides, a master of oratory, and delivered many public speeches, commendable alike for their logic and eloquence. His cheerful and kindly disposition, lofty idealism and broad-minded enthusiasm added to the esteem to which his long years of public service have entitled him.

THE EVOLUTION OF CANADIAN SENTIMENT

Hon. George W. Ross

From a speech at the Empire Club, 1905

IT is not hard to believe, I think you will accept the proposition readily, that there was a time when there was no such thing as Canadian loyalty. I suppose that is true in the evolution of a family. There is no such thing as the full development of the spirit of home in man until he feels he has a home for himself. When our fathers came here they came to a land in which they had their fortunes to make if there was a chance for them; which land was entirely destitute of a history and in order to give themselves any identity or individuality at all they had to attach themselves to the land from which they came. It is only, Sir, within the last few years we knew we were Canadians. I am sorry to say in Great Britain they hardly know we are Canadians yet. They generally speak of us as Americans, as if there was not in the term "Canadian" a sweetness and a power which cannot issue, and which we must not allow to issue from the rather mal-appropriated term "American" which some people in this country use for themselves. I said our first sentiments of connection with Canada were entirely that of British connection, and all our first efforts to preserve our identity were efforts not to preserve the identity or the existence of Canada, but were to preserve that British connection which we transferred, or our fathers transferred, to this country by their settlement here.

The War of 1812 was not a war engaged in by Canadians for Canada, it was a war to maintain British connection. The object of the Americans was to annex us. We fought to maintain British connection. There may have been perhaps a scintilla of Canadian love and loyalty; there may have been in the minds of some of us the idea that we were fighting for the land in which we live and for the property which we possess and for our homes, but these ideas were in the form in which a man fights for any goods he may have in his possession when waylaid by the highwayman. But the prevailing idea and the main consideration which led to the fight of 1812, so far as we were concerned, was to preserve Canada to Great Britain and not to preserve it to Canadians. When we came to the rebellion of 1837 many years afterwards, that trouble was suppressed through the idea that the promoters of the Rebellion had in their minds the diversion of Canada to the United States. We fought then in 1837 without any prevailing or predominating idea that we were fighting for Canada or fighting for Canadian privileges; we were fighting to remain under the British flag.

Really as I read history, Canadians did not feel even then that we had a Canada to fight for. And what is true of our efforts, and very proper and praiseworthy efforts they were, to maintain British connection is also true of much of our trade arrangements of the time. For instance, if you read the life of Lord Elgin, you will find that the Treaty of Reciprocity was made not from a Canadian stand-

point as much as from the British standpoint. By the abolition of the Corn Laws and the abrogation of the Preferential Tariff which existed then between Canada and Great Britain in the matter of lumber and wheat and flour, our trade with Great Britain was practically destroyed and the instructions to Lord Elgin were, in order to overcome the discontent which prevailed in Canada at the loss of business, to make an effort to establish better trade relations with the United States in order that the Canadians might be content and continue their allegiance to the British Crown. So that the whole history of Canada up to Confederation, and that itself, as I shall show in a moment, was a history in which the standpoint of the Canadian was that of British connection, a worthy standpoint to be sure, but yet a standpoint which had not in it those elements of loyalty which were subsequently injected into the Canadian mind.

And, coming to the Confederation itself, if you read the discussion in the House of Lords when the Bill was introduced by the Colonial Secretary you will there find one of the objects of Confederation was to unite the Canadian Provinces so that they might present a united front to the Americans should the Americans be too aggressive. The preamble of that Act shows that pretty clearly because it refers to the establishment in Canada of a Government after the model of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. So that even in that very recent stage in our history the Canadian standpoint was one of British connection rather than of, shall I

say, an integral, ingrained, devoted loyalty to Canada itself.

The next stage was a different one that practically grew out of the Confederation of 1867, largely moved, too, by a party organization at that time known as the Canada First party, which had some excellent qualities and which for some time endeavored to direct Canadian sentiment; in some respects I think wrongfully, in other respects rightfully, towards the intrinsic merits of Canada itself and directing us also to the duty of loving Canada because it was great enough to be loved, because it was good enough to be loved and because it had in its constitution those elements of freedom and liberty which made for greatness; that it was our duty not to fear about greatness but to look boldly upon the future and to meet it with a loyal heart, remembering the words of Tennyson:

> "We sailed wherever ship could sail;
> We founded many a mighty state.
> Pray Heaven our greatness may not fail
> Through craven fear of being great."

And we got that sentiment, and that sentiment grew in the Canadian mind. I do not want to call it Canada First sentiment except for the convenience of the term; for I would like to sever it from some elements that constituted the Canada First party. Let us look at the evolution from the time of the Confederation of 1867. I believe we builded better than we knew then. I believe the Fathers of Con-

federation, like the Fathers of the American Republic, even like the great Bismarck who founded the German Confederation, did not conceive of the future which we now see, much less of the future which our children shall see, as the foundation of that Confederation was laid in 1867. The first thing we did was to look around and with true Scotch frugality and British prudence endeavoured to see if we were having a clear title to the half of this Continent and we immediately negotiated with Great Britain or with the Hudson's Bay Company for the possession of Rupert's Land, thus getting our hands upon practically a great empire, that which may be the greatest part of Canada yet, reaching from the boundary of Ontario on the west to the foot of the Rocky Mountains and north as far as ship can sail and farther still.

That showed that before we were practically twelve months old we had caught the inspiration of true Canadianism and we were seeking to clear the decks, as it were, for greater prosperity and progress, and we got that great territory and it was well we got it then, for had we delayed the purchase thereof it would have cost us much more. Then, having got the territory, what did we do? We began as four Provinces and immediately this little family of four members multiplied and increased and we, as by a repetition of history, became possessed with the same spirit which animated the founders of the American Republic. They began with thirteen States and in a few years there were fifteen, and seventeen and so on. As Madison said to Jefferson when they were trying to get the Constitution of the United

States adopted by the other States: "We must not allow State rights to interfere nor must we look upon this Federation of ours from the standpoint of individual States, but we must think continentally." And the Americans thought continentally and they got Florida from Spain, and Louisiana from France, and they took Texas for themselves. They would have done more if we had let them. Think of their getting from France the vast territory which they did! They thought continentally.

The ink was scarcely dry upon our Constitution when we began to think constitutionally. We began to think federally; we carved out Manitoba in 1869, we federated with British Columbia in 1871, with Prince Edward Island in 1873. We are making two more Provinces just now. Amid a great deal of confusion and a great deal of debate and discussion this new baby is born under certain disquieting circumstances but we shall have two Provinces more. These twins will add to our Provinces and make them nine, and the true Canadian will not rest until Newfoundland is within the boundaries of the Constitution. That was the spirit that was born in 1867 and that is the spirit still. We must have elbow room. Britain has about one-quarter of the whole habitable portion of the globe to-day, and John Bull sometimes feels himself a little squeezed in approaching certain portions of his territory. We must have elbow room, not for ourselves simply, but for the generations yet to come. We have got it and therefore we have territory enough to call forth the highest demands upon our loyalty.

STEPHEN LEACOCK

STEPHEN LEACOCK

1869-

THERE are three Stephen Leacocks wrapped up in the one personality; the university professor of academic mind and writer of "Elements of Political Science;" the political speaker and popular lecturer; and the humourist and writer of the "Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town," "Literary Lapses," "Behind the Beyond," and other "Nonsense Novels."

Stephen Butler Leacock was born in England on December 30, 1869 at Swanmoor, Hants, but came to Canada as a boy. He was educated at Upper Canada College, Toronto, and at the University of Toronto. After graduation he engaged in school-teaching and for several years taught languages at Upper Canada College. In his preface to the "Sunshine Sketches" he tells us that in 1899 he "gave up school-teaching in disgust, borrowed enough money to live upon for a few months and went to the University of Chicago to study economics and political science." He was soon appointed to a Fellowship in political economy and in 1903 he took the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Since then he has belonged to the staff of McGill University, Montreal, first as lecturer in political science, then as associate professor in political science and history, and finally as head of the department of Economics and Political Science.

Having solved the problem of a livelihood—"the emolument is so high as to place me distinctly above the policemen, postmen, street-car conductors and other salaried officials of the neighbourhood"—he was able to devote his leisure to writing and to spreading the Gospel of Humour.

The world seems as a rule to accept Stevenson's theory that a man's recreations make up his real life, and it is as a humorous writer that Professor Leacock is most widely known. He himself has said that he would rather have written "Alice in Wonderland" than the whole Encyclopædia Britannica. Occasionally his humour lacks spontaneity, but his masterpieces effervesce with fun and wit. On the whole his writings entitle him to the first place among Canadian humourists, and he is hailed with joy as a bringer of laughter from coast to coast.

EDUCATION AND EMPIRE UNITY

PROFESSOR STEPHEN LEACOCK.

From an address made before the Empire Club, Toronto, 1907.

WE must realize, and the people of England must realize, the inevitable greatness of Canada. This is not a vainglorious boast. This is not a rhodomontade. It is a simple fact. Here we stand, six million people, heirs to the greatest legacy in the history of mankind, owners of half a continent, trustees, under God Almighty, for the fertile solitudes of the West. A little people, few in number, say you? Ah, truly such a little people! Few as the people of the Greeks that blocked the mountain gates of Europe to the march of Asia, few as the men of Rome that built a power to dominate the world, nay, scarce more numerous than they in England whose beacons flamed along the cliffs a warning to the heavy galleons of Spain. Aye, such a little people, but growing, growing, growing, with a march that shall make us ten millions to-morrow, twenty millions in our children's time and a hundred millions yet ere the century runs out.

What say you to Fort Garry, a stockaded fort in your father's day, with its hundred thousand of to-day and its half a million souls of to-morrow? What think you, little River Thames, of our great Ottawa that flings its foam eight hundred miles? What does it mean when science has moved us a little further yet, and the wheel of the world's work turns with electric force? What sort of asset do you think then our melting snow and the roaring river-flood of our

Canadian spring shall be to us? What say you, little puffing steam-fed industry of England, to the industry of coming Canada? Think you, you can heave your coal hard enough, sweating and grunting with your shovel to keep pace with the snow-fed cataracts of the north? Or look, were it but for double conviction, at the sheer extent and size of us. Throw aside, if you will, the vast districts of the frozen north; confiscate, if you like, Ungava, still snow-covered and unknown, and let us talk of the Canada that we know, south of the sixteenth parallel, south of your Shetland Islands, south of the Russian Petersburg and reaching southward thence to where the peach groves of Niagara bloom in the latitude of Northern Spain. And of all this take only our two new provinces, twin giants of the future, Alberta and Saskatchewan. Three decades ago this was a great lone land, the frozen west, with its herds of bison and its Indian tepees, known to you only in the pictured desolation of its unending snow; now crossed and inter-crossed with railways, settled 400 miles from the American frontier, and sending north and south the packets of its daily papers from its two provincial capitals. And of this country, fertile as the corn plains of Hungary, and the crowded flats of Belgium, do you know the size? It is this. Put together the whole German Empire, the republic of France and your England and Scotland, and you shall find place for them in our two new provinces. Or take together across the boundary from us, the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut—all the New England States

—and with them all the Middle States of the North—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois and Wisconsin—till you have marked a space upon the map from the Atlantic to the Mississippi and from Ohio to the Lakes—all these you shall put into our two new provinces and still find space for England and for Scotland in their boundaries.

The signs of the times are written large as to what the destiny of Canada shall not be. Not as it is—not on this colonial footing—can it indefinitely last. There are those who tell us that it is best to leave well enough alone, to wait for the slow growth, the evolution of things. For herein lies the darling thought of the wisdom of the nineteenth century, in the same evolution, this ready-made explanation of all things; hauled over the researches of the botanist to meet the lack of thought of the philosopher. Whatever is, is; whatever will be, will be—so runs its silly creed. Therefore let everything be, that is; and all that shall be, shall be. This is but the wisdom of the fool wise after the fact. For the solution of our vexed colonial problem this profits nothing. We cannot sit passive to watch our growth. Good or bad, straight or crooked, we must make our fate.

Nor is it even possible or desirable that we in Canada can form an independent country. The little cry that here and there goes up among us is but the symptom of an aspiring discontent, that will not let our people longer be colonials. 'Tis but a cry forced out by what a wise man has called "the growing pains of a nation's progress." Independent, we could

not survive a decade. Those of us who know our country realize that beneath its surface smoulder still the embers of racial feud and of religious bitterness. Twice in our generation has the sudden alarm of conflict broken upon the quiet of our prosperity with the sound of a fire-bell in the night. Not thus our path. Let us compose the feud and still the strife of races, not in the artificial partnership of Independent Canada, but in the joint greatness of a common destiny.

Nor does our future lie in union with those that dwell to the southward. The day of annexation to the United States is past. Our future lies elsewhere. Be it said without concealment and without bitterness. They have chosen their lot; we have chosen ours. Let us go our separate ways in peace. Let them keep their perennial Independence Day, with its fulminating fireworks and its Yankee Doodle. We keep our Magna Charta and our rough-and-ready Rule Britannia, shouting as lustily as they! The propaganda of annexation is dead.

JAMES A. MACDONALD

JAMES A. MACDONALD

1862-1923

REV. DR. JAMES ALEXANDER MACDONALD, preacher, lecturer and journalist, was born in Middlesex County, Ontario, in 1862. His forceful, independent spirit can be traced in his forefathers through the pioneer in Ontario and Nova Scotia back to the Macdonalds and Grants, warriors in the Highlands of Scotland.

J. A. Macdonald attended collegiate institute in Toronto and Hamilton, studied at Toronto and Edinburgh Universities, and was trained for the ministry at Knox College, Toronto. From 1881 to 1896 he was pastor of a Presbyterian church in St. Thomas. There he established his reputation as a powerful preacher and a magnetic lecturer.

But he soon turned to work in which he could send his message over a larger field. Evidences of his gift for journalism had appeared while he was still a student, for he had edited the *Knox College Monthly*. In 1896 he returned to Toronto as editor of the *Westminster*, a religious monthly magazine, in which his articles on topics of the day were widely read. His interests were diverse, for during this period he acted also as Principal of the Presbyterian Ladies' College. In 1902 he became editor-in-chief of the *Daily Globe*, Toronto, and won a

very high place among Canadian journalists. In 1909 he was a delegate to the Imperial Press Conference in London, England, and was given an honorary degree by the University of Glasgow. A similar honor was conferred on him later by the University of Birmingham.

While upholding the principles of the Liberal party, Dr. Macdonald showed an unusual fairness and independence of thought, that gave weight to his opinions on any phase of politics in Canada. His interest in national and international affairs, his advocacy of democratic ideals, his work toward arbitration and world peace, combined to give his writings a widespread appeal. In 1911 he was appointed a director of the World's Peace Foundation for promoting the settlement of international disputes by judicial arbitration. After an illness extending over a number of years he passed away in Toronto, in May, 1923.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Rev. J. A. Macdonald

From an address before the Canadian Club, Toronto, 1911

IF Canada would, indeed, play a great part among the nations, her standing must be maintained as free among the free nations comprising the British Empire, without abatement of any powers of self-government and with due regard for the obligations of Empire. None of the rights of responsible government won half a century ago can be surrendered to any theory of imperialism. And those rights, which give dignity and worth to all other privileges, must be made to match the new obligations which the relations of world-wide empire impose. Canada must make and administer her own laws, police her own shores, and do her share in keeping the peace on the high seas. But all this she must do in alliance with the rest of the Empire, and in the free exercise of her own responsible judgment. National autonomy is of the very essence of national freedom, and freedom is the source and secret of enduring loyalty. This is the glorious British way. By it Canada has grown in loyalty as she grew in power. And by it South Africa, that a decade ago was seething with rebellion, is now justifying once more to the world the all-conquering power of Britain's confidence in that liberty by which she makes free all the nations under the flag. Let us not doubt it. We may have no precedent for a world empire of free nations.

Let us make one. Britain had to blaze the way for responsible government. Canada blazed the way for overseas confederation. Let Britain and Canada and the other British dominions give the world a new type of empire in which the measure of individual freedom is the measure of imperial loyalty.

But Canada's relations are not with Britain alone, but with America as well. A partner in the English-speaking fraternity, a factor in Anglo-American arbitration proposals, an ally for the security of America, Canada's position on this continent is a pledge of peace, not for America alone, but for the world. Believe me, the problem of Canada's future and the part and place of this young nation in the development of American life, while uncertain enough to command our severest thought, is hopeful enough to inspire our highest effort.

Time was, and not many years ago, when many thoughtful Canadians saw no future for this country except in political union with the United States. Some who were then not averse to such an issue are now the stoutest protesters against even ordinary trade relations. Time was, too, when thoughtful men in the United States looked forward to the annexation of Canada as an inevitable and not far-off event. The situation has completely changed. Annexation is no longer an open question. I do not know one informed and respectable leader of opinion in the United States who advocates it or wishes it. In a chance, but not unfruitful, conference which I had with President Taft in March of last year, when

the ground was covered from the maximum and minimum tariff clause to the proposed Anglo-American arbitration treaty, the Chief Executive of the Republic assured me in terms and with an emphasis not to be mistaken, that the political union of these two nations is, from the American point of view, not only not desired, but not desirable. Since the incident at Manila Bay; since the United States was pushed out into world-politics; since the Orient loomed large on the horizon, there has come to their men of thought and leadership a new experience and a new insight. They appreciate now as they never did before the significance of the Union Jack on the north half of this continent. "The Pacific is a safer situation," said President Taft, "because two flags, not one, represent the power of English-speaking civilization." The past half dozen years of diplomatic history illustrates this new attitude. Today not one commanding voice, either in Canada or in the United States, would be given for annexation. That is the great new fact which shines on the horizon of Canada's international relations.

But through all these problems there runs the question: How is the ideal of the nation of eight millions to be kept unlowered and unspoiled against the day when Canada shall have eighty millions? In answering that question each man of us has his opportunity for service. Parliament and the politicians have their tasks, but the real chance is for the man out of office. Official obligations smother and hamper. In the freedom of simple citizenship the

man who has a message will get his audience. The dignities of office are insignificant compared with the chance to awaken and direct the opinion of the people. Let who will be Premier or President; it is the man who moulds the people's thoughts that rules the democracies of America.

GEORGE E. FOSTER

GEORGE E. FOSTER

1847-

SIR GEORGE FOSTER is a well-known figure in Canadian political life. For forty years he has been an active member of the Dominion Parliament and he has had the unparalleled record of serving under every Conservative Prime Minister of Canada. His powerful intellect, strong moral convictions, and his wonderful gifts of oratory have made him a mighty influence among the Conservative ranks, and though by nature unfitted to lead a party, he has often been "the power behind the throne."

He was born in New Brunswick in 1847, was educated in the local schools, and in the University of New Brunswick, and began his public career as a school teacher. In this profession he was decidedly successful, but in 1879 he resigned the professorship of classics in New Brunswick University to enter the business world, from which he retired in 1906.

His political career commenced in 1882, and from the outset he made his presence felt in the House. He was tireless in exposing negligence and corruption, and was a scourge to political offenders. His marvellous capacity for combining reason with passion, and of humanizing statistics, gave him a position of great prestige, on the parliamentary floor as well as on the public platform.

He joined Sir John A. Macdonald's Cabinet in 1885 as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, became Minister of Finance in 1889, and Minister of Trade and Commerce from 1911 until the fall of the Unionist Government in 1921. In all three of these portfolios he laboured with characteristic zeal, especially during the Great War when he instituted a campaign in favor of economy and greater production.

He is a fervent Imperialist, and in 1903 gave a series of powerful addresses in Great Britain supporting Chamberlain's agitation for Imperial Trade Preference. He was called to the Imperial Privy Council in 1916, and was appointed one of the four representatives of Great Britain to the Economics Conference of the Allies, at Paris, in the same year. He was also actively interested in the League of Nations, and was elected Vice-President of the Canadian branch of the League of Nations in 1920. In 1921 he was elevated to the Senate, where he still takes a strong interest in national affairs.

Throughout his life he has followed the dictates of conscience, and his efforts at moral reform have been ceaseless. For years he has been identified with the Temperance movement, and he has given a number of eloquent addresses in its behalf. His passionate earnestness and moral intensity, while robbing him of the personal charm and humorous appeal which characterized his great Conservative Chief, Sir John A. Macdonald, have given him a convincing personality and an outstanding place among Canadian statesmen.

THE CALL OF CANADA

Sir George E. Foster

From an address before the Royal Colonial Institute, June, 1913

WHEN a man from Nova Scotia goes to British Columbia he is not called an emigrant. He has simply moved. What reason is there in the world, when a man goes from Scotland to Australia or to Canada, that he should not be put in the same class as the man who has simply moved and not emigrated? The head and centre of the Empire is poorer by 138,000 people, provided they have not moved to another portion of the Empire. Therein lies the whole question. There should be but one Empire. The citizen of one portion of it should be a citizen in every other portion of it; the man who goes from one to another has simply transferred his home, and not transferred his national characteristics. If these great, mighty outlying dominions continue to grow, as they will grow, and their populations increase, fifty years will put the heart of the Empire and the outlying portions of the Empire in a very different position the one to the other. Are we not going to think about these things? Shall it always be *laissez faire*?

Yonder are indications of fire, behind it the wind is driving the flames towards your home; here you are, in your own home, asking yourself how many rooms you shall have within your dwelling, what compartments they shall be divided into, and what

furniture shall be placed in each. You are warned of the danger. "But," you say, "Let us settle this business first. Let us see how we are going to locate our own compartments and furnish our own rooms. "Do not be excited over the fire," you say. "God is good, anyway—the wind may change." You can take that and translate it into a thought of Empire. From this day forward, "accursed be *laissez faire.*" Call it laziness—incapacity if you like; call it cowardice if that be the best name; but in the name of Heaven, men who have done what the outside dominions have done, men who have done what the men of this great heart of Empire have done—shall we not come together and sit around one common table, put our wits to work, and join our hearts and brains, our wisdom and our experience, from every part of this Empire, and organize?

What would Canada have been to-day had she not organized? What would this Empire have been without organization? Within twenty-five years it has outgrown the old organization. Shall we lie down, or sit still, and confess that we are not able to make the new and necessary organization which shall keep this Empire one, which will make those outside dominions synonymous with the growth of Empire as a whole? Shall we not take counsel together, plan together, work together, and so build up for the future an Empire which in the past has done so much for civilization, and which has so much left to do? Does any man here believe that the British Empire has fulfilled its mission—the mission to its own genera-

tions unborn, if you go no further—its mission to the world, for which it has great things in trust? This work can only be carried on by the fullest co-operation, and by calling ultimately to the seats of council the best experience that the whole Empire grows beneath its wide skies and upon its broad fields.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER

WHEN GREAT BRITAIN IS AT WAR WE ARE AT WAR

SIR WILFRID LAURIER

From an address in the House of Commons, Ottawa August 19th, 1914

THE gravity of the occasion which has called us together makes it incumbent upon us even to disregard the formalities and conventionalities which in ordinary times the rules of the House, written and unwritten, enjoin as a wise safeguard against precipitate action, but which, on such an occasion as this, might impede us in dealing with the momentous question before us. This session has been called for the purpose of giving the authority of Parliament and the sanction of the law to such measures as have already been taken by the Government, and any further measures that may be needed, to insure the defence of Canada and to give what aid may be in our power to the mother country in the stupendous struggle which now confronts her. Speaking for those who sit around me, speaking for the wide constituencies which we represent in this House, I hasten to say that to all these measures we are prepared to give immediate assent. If in what has been done or in what remains to be done there may be anything which in our judgment should not be done or should be differently done, we raise no question, we take no exception, we offer no criticism, and we shall offer no criticism so long as there is danger at the front. It is

our duty, more pressing upon us than all other duties, at once, on this first day of this extraordinary session of the Canadian Parliament, to let Great Britain know, and to let the friends and foes of Great Britain know, that there is in Canada but one mind and one heart, and that all Canadians stand behind the mother country, conscious and proud that she has engaged in this war, not from any selfish motive, for any purpose of aggrandizement, but to maintain untarnished the honour of her name, to fulfil her obligations to her allies, to maintain her treaty obligations and to save civilization from the unbridled lust of conquest and domination.

We are British subjects, and to-day we are face to face with the consequences which are involved in that proud fact. Long we have enjoyed the benefits of our British citizenship; to-day it is our duty to accept its responsibilities and its sacrifices. We have long said that when Great Britain is at war, we are at war; to-day we realize that Great Britain is at war and that Canada is at war also. Our territory is liable to attack and to invasion. So far as invasion is concerned, I do not see that there is any case for apprehension, for it seems to me obvious that neither Austria nor Germany, our foes in this war, can command any able force to make an attack so far from their base. But no one pretends that our maritime cities on the Pacific and the Atlantic, are free from the possibility of insult by an audacious corsair, who, descending suddenly upon our shores, might subject them to an insolent raid and decamp with his booty before punishment could reach him. This is not an

unfounded dread of danger; this is no mere illusion; it is a real and indeed a proximate danger, since it is a matter of notoriety that both on the Pacific and on the Atlantic there are German cruisers whose mission it is to inflict all the injury they can upon our commerce, and even to raid our cities should they find our harbours unguarded. We are aware that the Government has already taken measures, and very appropriately, to guard against this danger. We know that one of our battleships on the Pacific has been seeking the enemy, and if she has not yet engaged him, it is because the enemy has eluded her pursuit.

We have had another and more striking evidence that when Great Britain is at war we are at war, in this—that our commerce has been interrupted, and perhaps the expression would not be too strong if I were to say that it has been to some extent dislocated. From the day war was declared—nay, from the day the possibility of war was first mooted—our shipping to Great Britain and to Europe has been interrupted. Ships were lying at the docks fully loaded and ready to put to sea, but unable to do so because of the fact that when England is at war Canadian property on the high seas is liable to capture. Our ships therefore had to remain in port so long as precautions had not been taken to clear the way and to ensure their safe passage cross the ocean. What measures have been taken in regard to that we have not yet been told, but I have no doubt that we shall have that information in due time.

The correspondence brought down yesterday, however, has informed us that the Canadian Government

has already taken steps to send a contingent of twenty thousand men or thereabouts to take their place in the firing line. Upon this occasion I owe it to the House and to myself to speak with absolute frankness and candour. This is a subject which has often been an occasion of debate in this House. I have always said, and I repeat it on this occasion, that there is but one mind and one heart in Canada. At other times we may have had different views as to the methods by which we are to serve our country and our empire. More than once have I declared that if England were ever in danger—nay, not only in danger, but if she were ever engaged in such a contest as would put her strength to the test—then it would be the duty of Canada to assist the motherland to the utmost of Canada's ability. England to-day is not engaged in an ordinary contest. The war in which she is engaged will in all probability—nay, in absolute certainty—stagger the world with its magnitude and its horror. But that war is for as noble a cause as ever impelled a nation to risk her all upon the arbitrament of the sword. That question is no longer at issue; the judgment of the world has already pronounced upon it. I speak not only of those nations which are engaged in this war, but of the neutral nations. The testimony of the ablest men of these nations, without dissenting voice, is that to-day the allied nations are fighting for freedom against oppression, for democracy against autocracy, for civilization against reversion to that state of barbarism in which the supreme law is the law of might.

SIR GEORGE E. FOSTER

CANADA AND THE WAR

Sir George E. Foster

From a speech at the close of the Special War Session of the Parliament of Canada, 1914

I DO not feel that I am capable of saying what I would like to say. I feel at the present time a great deal more than I have the power to express. I feel the solemnity of this hour. We are meeting as a band of Canadians of different races and nationalities and languages; but never in the history of Canada have we met feeling that we were one in the same sense as at this hour of our history. That generosity which sometimes lies more or less concealed in partisan and racial disputes has burst all those ignoble bonds, and a feeling of pure patriotism, love of country and devotion to what the flag symbolizes, has come to the front disfigured by no mean or petty purpose.

The last four days of this session of Parliament have vindicated Canadian public life and parliamentary life for all time to come. They have shown that it is possible for us to forget all mean and petty things when our country and its highest liberties are at stake. We have these rooms to-day, and we may meet again in some months; but what will have happened in that intervening time? The issues of war are never certain until they are settled. It does not always happen that the right triumphs in the one battle or the one campaign. In this war nearly twenty millions of armed men will probably be face to face or within range of each other before the finality of the contest is determined. What will

happen? Will the right and true prevail this time, or must there be more sacrifice and many years before they ultimately prevail?

The one solemn thing for us to remember to-day is that there is more to war than the first march out of the troops, the first blare of the trumpet and the first flaunting of the flag. What there is more to war has been demonstrated in Belgium in these last thirteen or fourteen days, when their homes have gone up in flames, when their wives and their children have given over to hardship and death, and when their own bodies, as strong and valiant as ours, have been shattered by the grim weapons of war. We have not had that experience. But it may yet be ours, and my word to this House and to this country to-day is to put on the full armour of courage and confidence, not to be daunted by a temporary reverse or by a series of reverses, but to feel sure that justice will burn forth bright and strong in proportion to our readiness to make the necessary sacrifice, and as the fires of this sacrifice burn away what is selfish and base in our country, our people and ourselves.

Some of our companions and colleagues march out to-day and will go forward to the front. Let us remember with our best wishes and follow with our deepest prayers those of our comrades who are about to take the sword in defence of liberty and the right.

I cannot say more, and I should have been sorry to have said less. The time of trial is upon this country and the Empire. It will do us good in the end. God and the right will finally triumph.

RODOLPHE LEMIEUX

RODOLPHE LEMIEUX

1866-

PROMINENT among the orators of Canada stands Rodolphe Lemieux, the noted statesman and lawyer, with the blood of Normandy in his veins. His fluency in English and French is equally remarkable, yet notwithstanding his magnificent command of language he is never carried beyond the pale of reason and of practical common sense.

He was born in Montreal in 1866, and received his earlier education at Nicolet College. After a youthful venture in journalism, he studied law at Laval University, and was called to the Bar in 1891. He has achieved a brilliant record in his profession, and is recognized as one of the leaders of the Quebec Bar. In 1896 he became a member of the law faculty of Laval University, where until 1906 he lectured on the History of Canadian Law.

His parliamentary career dates from 1896, and he has served his country in the House of Commons for twenty-six years. In 1906 he entered the Laurier Cabinet as Postmaster General, but retired with the fall of the Laurier Government in 1911. He was offered a portfolio in the King Cabinet but declined it, and was elected Speaker of the House of Commons in March, 1922, a position for which he is pre-eminently fitted by virtue of his tact and his strong mental balance.

He is a born diplomatist, and has been sent as an ambassador to foreign countries on various missions. In 1907 he went to Japan in connection with the limitation of Japanese immigrants to Canada. In 1909 he represented Canada at the commemoration of the founding of the Postal Union held at Berne, Switzerland, and the following year was Canada's representative at the opening of the South African Union Parliament.

His knowledge of Canadian constitutional development is profound, and he is also a keen admirer of British institutions. He is a man of wide culture, has a thorough background of English literature and wields a very facile pen.

In 1903 he favoured the independence of Canada by peaceful means when the Chamberlain agitation for Imperial federation was at its height, but has since become a convinced Imperialist. During the war his loyalty to Great Britain was unmistakably demonstrated, for he was Quebec's most energetic recruiting sergeant, and was eloquent in maintaining the necessity for Canada's participation in the war, and in breaking down the objections of the Quebec Nationalists.

Lemieux's political creed is broad and uplifting. He is interested in social legislation, and was the father of the Lemieux Act of 1907, which provided a peaceful method for settling labour disputes. With his moral integrity, his intellectual brilliancy, and his sound common sense, he is a decided asset to Canadian politics.

THE QUEBEC ACT

Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux

From his address to the Canadian Club, Toronto, 1914

UNDER the benign influence of the Crown, our traditions have been preserved, our customs and our laws have been maintained. Religious liberty we fully enjoy. The French language is officially recognized. It is freely used in the courts of the land and in Parliament.

Indeed, if we did not cling to the memories of the past, we should be unworthy of the great nation which gave us life. If we did not proclaim our loyalty, we should be ungrateful to the great nation which gave us liberty. French by descent and affection, we are British by allegiance and conviction.

The Quebec Act is considered as the Magna Charta of the French Catholic subjects of Great Britain in North America. And by all Canadians, in my humble judgment, it should be looked upon as one of the foundation stones of that greatest of human fabrics—the modern British Empire.

The Act was brought before the House of Lords by the Earl of Dartmouth on May 2nd, 1774, and passed without any opposition on May 17th. From May 26th until June 13th it was discussed in the House of Commons. The principle of the Act fixed no territory limits for the Province. It comprised not only the country affected by the proclamation of 1763, but also all the eastern territory which had previously been annexed to Newfoundland. In the west and southwest the province was extended to

the Ohio and the Mississippi, and, in fact, enclosed all the lands beyond the Alleghanies coveted and claimed by the old English colonies now hemmed in between the Atlantic and the Appalachian Range.

It was now expressly enacted that the Roman Catholic inhabitants of Canada should thenceforth "enjoy the free exercise" of their religion "subject to the King's supremacy declared and established" by law, and on condition of taking an oath of allegiance set forth in the Act. The Roman Catholic clergy was allowed "to hold, receive and enjoy their accustomed dues and rights, with respect to such persons only as shall confess the said religion"—that is, one twenty-sixth part of the produce of the land, Protestants being specially exempted. The French-Canadians were allowed to enjoy all their property, together with all customs and usages incident thereto, "in as large, ample and beneficial manner" as if the proclamation or other acts of the Crown "had not been made;" but the religious orders and communities were accepted in accordance with the terms of the capitulation of Montreal. In "all matters of controversy relative to property and civil rights," resort was to be had to the old civil law of French Canada "as the rule for the decision of the same;" but the criminal law of England was extended to the province on the indisputable ground that its "certainty and lenity" were already "sensibly felt by the inhabitants from an experience of more than nine years." The government of the province was entrusted to a Governor and a Legislative Council appointed by the Crown "inasmuch as it was inexpedient to call the

assembly." The council was to be composed of not more than twenty-three residents of the province. At the same time the British Parliament made special enactments for the imposition of certain customs duties "towards defraying the charges of the administration of justice and the support of the civil government of the province." All deficiencies in the revenues derived from these and other sources had to be supplied by the Imperial treasury.

In French Canada the Act was received without any popular demonstration, but the men to whom the great body of people always looked for advice and guidance, the priests, cures and seigneurs naturally regarded these concessions to their nationality as giving most unquestionable evidence of the consideration and liberal spirit in which the British Government was determined to rule the Province. They had had ever since the conquest satisfactory proof that their religion was secure from all interference, and now the British Parliament itself came forward with legal guarantees not only for the free exercise of that religion, with all its incidents and tithes, but also for the permanent establishment of the civil law, to which they attached so much importance.

The fact that no provision was made for a popular assembly could not possibly offend the people to whom local self-government in any form was entirely unknown. It was not a measure primarily intended to check the growth of popular institutions, but solely framed to meet the actual conditions of a people unaccustomed to the working of representative institutions. It was a preliminary step in the develop-

ment of self-government. Such as it was, the Quebec Act was the first real bond of friendship between Canada and Great Britain.

The strength of British statesmanship throughout the history of Canada, and the history of the Empire —the strength of British diplomacy lay in its wisdom. I may say: Its wisdom is its strength; its strength is its wisdom. Reviewing the constitutional growth of Canada, there are three outstanding stages of development, each marking a large, a very large, measure of liberty. First, England gave us a representative government—it educated the French Canadians to the notion of popular government; second, it gave us responsible government; third, it gave us federal government. And at each stage, I am proud to say, Great Britain made secure for the French Canadians, the minority, its religion, its laws and customs, and its language. The traditional policy of Great Britain, for the student of history, is that England trusts her own people. She made the French Canadians loyal in 1774, because she trusted the French Canadians.

May I say, might I suggest to this audience in Toronto, that in these days of monopoly and trusts and mergers, there must not be any such monopoly as a monopoly of loyalty? Loyalty is not in the trade; it is not even patented; it is in the heart of every man. We may differ as to the methods of how best to serve the British Empire, but our aims are all the same. We may disagree on details, but we are all agreed on essentials. And I don't see the object of advertising, say, one half of this country as disloyal.

We are all loyal. The great bond of union of all is, not the Grit party nor the Tory party. The great bond of union for every Canadian, after all, is His Majesty the King and the Crown. And the great instrument of freedom, which belongs to me as well as it belongs to you, is the British Constitution, an unwritten instrument, which is as dear to me as it is to you. We may speak different languages, profess different creeds, but the French Canadian in Quebec, the Scotch in the Highlands, the Manxman, the Irishman, the Welshman, is as loyal, as patriotic, as the Englishman from Lancashire—or even from Toronto.

Then, if you ask me why I am a British subject, and why I wish to remain one? I reply, that I honour the flag that honours its obligations; that I prize most those institutions that secure me most strongly in my rights and liberties; and am proud to be a sharer in that great work of advancing peace and progress throughout the world, for which the British Empire stands; gratitude for what has been done for them in the past, contentment in the liberties which they to-day enjoy; pride in the greatness of England and her dominions scattered throughout the whole of the globe; this, and much more, warms the hearts of the French Canadians to the Motherland, and makes of them loyal subjects second to none under the British Crown. By the vastness of the Empire their imagination is stirred; by the self-government it insures, their confidence is secured.

Talk not of annexation of French Canada—because all that there is of charm in monarchy is retained in our constitution, and all that there is of democracy in a republic is retained.

ROBERT A. FALCONER

ROBERT A. FALCONER

1867-

TOLERATION, moderation, efficiency — Sir Robert Falconer stands for these three ideals in the University of Toronto. His calm, unimpassioned temperament assists him in his rather difficult task of preserving an equilibrium in the University, during an era marked by strong intellectual, as well as social, unrest. But despite his judicial air, he does not stand complacently outside the struggles of his age; his interest in national and international problems is sincere, and he has always aimed at a close co-operation between the world of ideas as represented by educational centres, and the world of facts as represented by the working-men in all countries.

Robert Falconer was born in Charlottetown, P.E.I., in 1867, but at an early age moved with his parents to Trinidad, B.W.I. where he received the groundwork of his education. He was chosen Gilchrist Scholar for London University, and in 1888 graduated with high honours in Classics. Later he received his M.A. degree in Classics at Edinburgh University, still later his B.D. degree, and in 1902 his degree of Doctor of Literature. He studied at famous German Universities as well, and on his return to Canada has received various honorary degrees from Canadian Universities.

In 1892 he was appointed lecturer in New Testament Exegesis at the Presbyterian College in Halifax, and his reputation increased steadily until in 1904, he became Principal of the College. Meanwhile he declined various offers from American Universities to join their staff, but, after some hesitation, accepted the invitation to the Presidency of the University of Toronto in 1907. He was then but forty years of age, and was reluctant to accept a position entailing so great a responsibility, especially when his predecessors had been venerable men with long years of experience to temper their judgment. But during the fifteen years of his Presidency he has shouldered his tremendous executive responsibility with the coolness and method of a railway magnate, and the studied impartiality of a Chief Justice.

Sir Robert Falconer has been actively interested in the social conditions of his day. He has given his whole-hearted support to the University Extension idea, and heartily approves of any plan which will bring education to the masses. His generous services to Canada and education in the Khaki University during the war will long be remembered. He is besides, a public speaker of note, and has written several books on history, theology and education. His writings and speeches are not characterized by strong originality or imaginative fire, for he is primarily an administrator, and is not temperamentally fitted to inflame the hearts of men. But in all of his works the strength of his intellect, and the accuracy of his judgments are clearly revealed.

THE MEANING OF THE WEST

Sir Robert Falconer

From a Speech on "The Quality of Canadian Life" 1917

THE creation of Western Canada is the most splendid achievement of our life since 1867. Manitoba became a province in 1870, British Columbia in the following year, and Saskatchewan and Alberta fulfilled in 1905 the dream of the Fathers of Confederation. Had it not been for the mysterious potency of the West, awaiting the day when it should be incorporated in the Union, it is doubtful whether any Dominion would have been called into being. The hope of that great lone land has been realized beyond expectation, though that was too small a measure of its capacity because its resources had been of set purpose disparaged. It was the Eastern Canadian who in a true sense discovered it, for Hudson's Bay or North-West Company traders kept its wealth guarded, and when the intruder from the East disturbed those silent spaces, the traders, as well as the half-breeds and the Indians, felt aggrieved. Fears and jealousies were the source of much trouble and, as a matter of history, the rising of 1885 is of importance because it finally relieved the prairies of the unrest which was bound to smoulder until once and for all it was decided that not the Indian or the half-breed, but the Canadian white-man was to be master. Other sources of discontent between different races and religions are not yet completely removed, but the West has boldly faced its problems, and it seems to be on the way to solve them with

justice and with as much compromise as is compatible with the determination that the English language and Canadian institutions are to prevail.

In the prairie provinces the history of the east repeats itself. There are the familiar stages of widening liberty; self-government was granted, with hesitation, to those who went in first, by the timid friends whom they had left behind and who were slow to believe that they were capable of exercising it. Of all the immigration in the earlier years that from Eastern Canada was the most abundant and forceful. Whole counties of Ontario seem to have been emptied into that new land. By heredity the people knew how to live in stern conditions and to face the unknown with courage. It is a fact of primary importance that the English-speaking Canadian first put the west in order, laid it out, stamped it with his own institutions and then invited in others; nor is it surprising that the vigorous spirit of himself and his children is still in control, even though of late a large and very effective body of Americans has entered from the Western States. They have not disputed his supremacy, and he may be proud of his accomplishments. These are a fine proof of his quality. He required imagination, courage, patience, the virtues on which the west is reared, and, had he not shown them, and had the American farmer gone in first, the future of this Dominion would have been different from that to which we look forward.

The stimulation of the climate may lead the Westerner to overmuch action and to make large drafts upon his future with confidence, but what he

has done is so wonderful that he has reason in venturing upon wide horizons. The Winnipeg of 1917, solid, with a reserve of power, the home of well-educated and comfortable people, so surpasses the loosely developed Winnipeg of twenty years ago that one may well hesitate to set bounds to its future. No city of the west is likely to rival it, but Regina, Saskatoon, Moosejaw, Calgary, Edmonton, all speak of Canadian pluck and energy. West of the mountains lies another section of the Dominion. British Columbia has a history of its own, but in Vancouver far east and far west meet, for not a little of the energy of that city of wonderful outlook comes from those who have left the Maritime provinces or Ontario to make their home on the Pacific slope. In the conduct of the Canadian west nothing is finer than the treatment of the Indian. The men sent out by the Dominion Government were not border adventurers, but high-minded and educated gentlemen who carried rigid scrupulousness into their dealings with the natives and made honourable treaties which have been honourably observed.

Our west never went through a riotous youth; it has few memories to be forgotten. From the first, life has been held sacred and respect has been paid to the law as rigidly as in the east, some of the credit being undoubtedly due to the Royal North-West mounted police force which the Dominion called into existence and has kept in high efficiency.

By its well ordered society and its political, educational and religious institutions, the west is shown to possess firmly fixed principles which have

simply been transferred to their new home by the first settlers from Eastern Canada. But every thinking Canadian asks himself the question, how long will this similarity between the west and the east continue? Though we are convinced that Canadian unity will be maintained, it is already evident that the west will soon possess a marked individuality and that the older influences will become fainter. Already the western man is impatient of his eastern brother and the incoming of the American will probably increase the criticism. It is therefore prudent to strengthen by every means in our power the bond between east and west, which is in danger of being stretched too thin at the Great Lakes if the two sections of the Dominion should pull apart in interest. Now is the time of our opportunity for the war has quickened our mutual sympathies and given us a new chance to coalesce.

So far I have spoken of the influence of the east upon the west, but already the west has begun to influence the policy of the east. Things have been done there which of ourselves we might have pronounced premature, if not impossible. In prohibition and woman suffrage they have led the way, and it is not improbable that they will be fertile in political, social and religious experiment and will compel the reluctant east to follow in their steps. Nor need we be alarmed at the prospect. They are still, in the majority, our kith and kin, they are as clear-headed as we and morally as sound, and one fact which we have learned of late is that policies

which were deemed impossible may be quite practicable when men of resolute purpose determine to put them into action. If imitation is the sincerest flattery, the west may be not altogether insensible to the compliment we pay them when we follow their example.

LOMER GOUIN

LOMER GOUIN

1861-

SIR LOMER GOUIN holds a unique place among French Canadian statesmen. Though devoid of the romantic charm and poetic eloquence which characterize the Gallic temperament, he has won the implicit confidence of his people, and is known as the Father of Quebec. No Anglo-Canadian is more sober, practical or cautious in disposition and speech, and no bank president has a more technical mind, or a more comprehensive grasp of details, than this unusual French-Canadian who for fifteen years administered the government of his province with such outstanding success.

He was born at Grondines, Quebec, in 1861, the son of a physician who gave his child every educational advantage. After taking the classical course, he studied law at Laval University, and was admitted to the Bar in 1884. He was eminently successful in his profession, and for fourteen years was Attorney-General of Quebec.

With his fine intellectual attainments and his statesman-like qualities it was natural that politics should attract him. He entered the Provincial Legislature in 1897, joined the Parent Ministry three years later, and when, in 1905, his chief was forced to resign, Gouin became Premier in his stead.

During the fifteen years of his administration, Quebec forged ahead in almost every branch of her public life. He devoted himself with tireless energy to her uniform advancement—along financial, agricultural, industrial and educational lines. His detailed knowledge of the resources of his province is marvellous. Its highways, waterways, industries, and thousands of its inhabitants are personally known to him. Yet despite his pride in and knowledge of Quebec, he is never betrayed into extravagant demonstrations of affection for it. He is a firm believer in Federation, for Quebec's sake, as well as for the welfare of Canada as a whole. He is also a staunch Imperialist, and his attitude toward Great Britain has not been without influence among his countrymen, who respect his great talents and value his vast service to their province.

During his career he has received many high honours. At the Quebec Tercentenary he was knighted by the Prince of Wales, now King George V, and in 1920 he was made Commandeur de la Legion d'Honneur by the French Government. He holds besides several honorary degrees from Canadian universities, and is President of the University of Montreal.

At present he occupies the portfolio of Minister of Justice in the Federal Cabinet, under Mackenzie King, and in this wide field critics who have taunted him with provincialism may have an opportunity to watch his interests expand into a broader nationalism.

QUEBEC AND CONFEDERATION

Sir Lomer Gouin

Delivered in the Legislative Assembly of Quebec, January 23, 1918

I DESIRE to define my position on this question very clearly. Mr. Speaker, I believe in the Canadian Confederation. The Federal system of government seems to me to be the only possible one for Canada in view of the differences in race and creed and also in view of the variety and multiplicity of the local needs of our immense territory.

To be even more precise I would say that if I had been a party to the negotiations of 1864 I would certainly have tried, had I had the authority, to obtain for the French Canadian minority in the sister provinces the same protection that was secured for the English minority in the Province of Quebec. I would not have asked this as a concession, but as a measure of justice. And even if it had not been granted, I would have voted in favor of the resolutions of 1864.

When the project was debated in 1865 I would have renewed my demand for that measure of prudence and of justice and if I had not succeeded I would still have declared myself in favour of the system which was adopted on the 13th of March, 1865. And even at the present hour, Mr. Speaker, despite the conflicts that have taken place in the administration of our country since 1867, despite the distress caused to those from Quebec who constitute a minority in the other provinces, if I had to

choose between Confederation and the Act of 1791 or the Act of 1840-41, I would be for Confederation.

For fifty years now, Mr. Speaker, we have lived under this system. We have had difficulties, it is true; we have had conflicts, more or less violent, but have we any right to say that the system has failed? *I believe just the contrary.*

When I regard the results achieved, when I mark the development that has taken place, when I take into account our progress, I am ready to say with Sir Wilfrid Laurier that "the hopes of the Fathers of Confederation have been surpassed."

Dorion, one of the finest and noblest figures of his time, dreaded the federal system because he feared that the Province of Quebec would be swamped in a great Canadian whole. The opponents of Confederation declared, as Dorion did, that Confederation was nothing more nor less than a step to legislative union. Can it be maintained to-day that those fears, that those misgivings were well founded? For fifty years now our Province has formed part of the Confederation and legislative union has not been brought about. We have legislated and we continue to freely legislate in the municipal and educational spheres and never have we been interfered with in the administration of our civil laws.

Our Province, as we have seen, thanks to Confederation, thanks to our union with the sister provinces, has progressed to a marvellous degree and certainly nobody can deny that it is due to Confederation that Montreal has in point of importance become the fourth city of North America. And if

we regard the French groups settled in the other provinces, can it be said that Confederation has been unfavorable to them? Would their position, would their lot be improved if Quebec broke the federal pact? There are in Canada to-day, outside the Province of Quebec, at least 500,000 French Canadians or more than half of the total number in the two Canadas in 1867. Would it be to the interest of our own people of whom I have spoken for the Province of Quebec to retire from the Confederation?

What would be the result, Mr. Speaker, if we were to separate from Confederation? I do not wish it to be thought for a moment that the honourable Member for Lotbiniere wished to raise that question. But as we are upon that ground it is better that each should express his thoughts. What position would we be in, shut off as we would be without any access to the sea during the winter months? How could we defend our immense frontier? What part of the national debt would we have to assume? What would be the customs tariffs of the Provinces with which we now trade freely? And finally, what would be the position of French Canadians outside of Quebec?

Lord Acton, the great English historian, has said that the liberty of a country is measured by the liberty of its minority. That is to say that if a minority is not well treated it is not it alone which suffers, as all those of the majority who have a right spirit, a just and generous heart, suffer with the minority and to the same extent as it does. We must not, Mr. Speaker, forget the good qualities of

others, we must remember that it is due to the combined qualities of all groups and of all races in the Dominion that our country has become great.

His Excellency, the Governor-General of Canada, the Duke of Devonshire, on the occasion of the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation last year truly said:

"Confederation will stand for all time as the monument of the work accomplished by the devotion, the unselfishness and the far-sighted vision of those men whom we are all proud to call the Fathers of the Confederation. To those men and their work we owe a debt which we can never repay, and it is for us, in our generation, to see that the glorious heritage to which we have succeeded shall be handed to those who come after us, unimpaired and, as far as lies in our power, with added glory and lustre."

Let us preserve, yes, Mr. Speaker, let us preserve intact our field of action and guard against even dreaming of diminishing the great task it is our mission to continue. Let us in the accomplishment of that task be inspired by the courage, by the faith, by the ideals of our ancestors, the discoverers of this country, and by the splendid visions of the Fathers of Confederation and thanks to our work, to our efforts and to our sacrifices, the 20th century will count our country amongst the great nations of the earth.

When I regard our immense territory, when I admire our old Provinces with all their rich historical

souvenirs, and the new born of yesterday, from the prairies and the virgin forests with their teeming power, I am proud of the name of Canadian, proud of my country—Canada. I am thankful that Providence allowed me to be born in this new and fruitful land which is sheltered from the bloody carnage that is now devastating Europe, a land of liberty, a land of equality, which knows no castes and which recognizes no superiority save that of talent, of effort, and of rectitude, a land where fruitful peace will bring union and concord and promote more progress and prosperity than in any other corner of the world.

It is in order to preserve to our country her greatness, to guard in the hearts of our children their hopes and to transmit to them unimpaired the heritage received from our fathers, that we should fight fearlessly under the passing storm, that we should work ceaselessly and without faltering for the development and maintenance of the Canadian Confederation.

WILLIAM LYON MACKENZIE KING

WILLIAM LYON MACKENZIE KING

1874-

UNTIL his elevation to the Premiership of Canada William Lyon Mackenzie King, grandson of the famous Canadian rebel and patriot, has been better known in the economic world than in the field of politics. His fame in economics is continent-wide. His combined interest in sociology and politics fits him admirably for the premiership at the reconstruction stage in Canadian history, and his thorough knowledge of industrial and social conditions is an excellent background for broad statesmanship at any period.

Mackenzie King, born in Kitchener in 1874, received his early education in the local schools, and entered the Political Science course at the University of Toronto. His keen interest in sociology led him to pursue the subject after graduation, and having received his M.A. in Toronto, he undertook post graduate work in Political Economy at the University of Chicago as well, and later at Harvard, where he received the degree of Ph.D. He won a Harvard fellowship, and studied economics at first hand in Great Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland and Italy.

Thus equipped, Mackenzie King made his debut in public life. In 1900 he became first Deputy Minister of Labour, under Sir William Mulock, and retained this position for eight years. He served

on several Royal Commissions on industrial and immigration problems, and acted as government conciliator in important industrial disputes. He possessed a genius for conciliating groups, due, doubtless, to the fervency of his belief that industry and humanity are not essentially antagonistic and irreconcilable elements. In 1909 he was appointed Minister of Labour, which portfolio he held until the downfall of the Laurier Government in 1911.

Because of his intelligent interest in labour disputes he was invited in 1914 to join the staff of the Rockefeller Foundation to make a practical study of industrial problems. In this capacity he rendered valuable service during the war in the adjustment of relations between workers and employers in great war industries of America. The result of his investigations found expression in his book "Industry and Humanity," which is a study of the principles underlying industrial reconstruction, and is an appreciable addition to the sum total of economic literature.

In 1919 he returned to Canadian public life to accept the leadership of the Liberal party in Canada, and in 1921 on the defeat of the Unionist Government became Prime Minister of the Dominion. Here he seeks to carry on the traditions of his late revered chief, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and to incorporate in Canadian Liberalism the new sociological viewpoint which is not only the result of his personal studies and experience, but is the unmistakable trend of world politics in the new era heralded by the Great War.

LIBERALISM AND RECONSTRUCTION

WM. L. MACKENZIE KING

Excerpts from Speeches delivered to Liberal supporters, August, 1919

IT has been my desire to pay some small tribute to the memory of our great and truly-revered leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I shall not attempt to pay any tribute to his name or memory in words of praise. What words of mine or of any man or woman in this room could equal the praise that has come from all countries, and all continents? No, I will give the praise which history will ever give, his own words and his own life: "Whatever we may do, we cannot deprive the people of the supreme command which they must have over their Legislatures and the members whom they elect. If there is one thing that is to save nations from revolution, it is that the governments of the different countries are truly representative of the people as a whole. All history has been a struggle to bring about that free and full representation."

And so, I say, looking back at the memory of our great Chief, and our great Leader, we Liberals of Canada have reason to be proud that in him we have one whose name will rank with those of Pym, Pitt, Bright, Gladstone, Lincoln,— men who have given their lives and existence in order that the right of the people to control Parliament, and the right of Parliament to control the Executive might be preserved in the name of freedom . . .

I shall, I am sure, be carrying out your wish if I

seek to the utmost of my ability in these great responsibilities to carry on the principles which he sought to make prevail throughout this vast Dominion and which I think can all be expressed in the maxim of an illustrious English statesman, Pym, who said that the form of government is best which doth actuate and dispose every part and member of the state to the common good . . .

The Liberal party will continue to stand as its illustrious leaders stood in the past, for unity, good will, and the open mind. It has no prejudice of race, creed or class. It is for equal rights and justice to all. It believes that problems of industry and nationality, like all questions of race and religion, can only be solved by the application of these principles. We want no cleavage along racial or religious lines. In imperial relations we are opposed to centralization. We are advocates of British unity based upon human relations, rather than upon governmental machinery, unity based upon self-government and the quality of the British community of nations. We are for friendly relations with the United States, and we are in sympathy with the movement to substitute friendly co-operation for conflict and jealousy in international relations with all countries . . .

If there is in Canada to-day one portion of its citizenry which more than any other is entitled to consideration, it is the men who risked their lives in battle and those who shared with them the dangers and privations of war, especially the families of those whose sons made the supreme sacrifice in the call of

the world's freedom. The war will be without its meaning to our day and generation unless we seek to make out of the sacrifices of the heroic dead, a new social order resplendent with the conception of liberty for which they gave their lives.

War has shown what can be accomplished by co-operation and sacrifice. If we can carry the spirit of co-operation and sacrifice into this period of reconstruction we have nothing to fear. If, on the other hand, each element in our national life is going to go its own gait, unwilling to join hands with the other groups that share like aims and aspirations to its own, then we may look for a prolongation of the period of confusion, and in the end retrogression rather than advance.

It is here that the supreme task of Liberalism comes in. Either we shall have an increasing growth of class consciousness on the part of each of the great groups, resulting, as all class consciousness growths are destined to result, in conflict with each other, and with forces that sooner or later are certain to oppose them; or we shall have a great progressive movement which will lead to a new era of social progress and social justice. It will all depend upon whether the spirit of good will is sufficiently strong to overcome the spirit that war breeds, and that continues to lurk in its wake.

Let us remember, however, that whatever perpetuates or augments that ill-will adds to the problem of Government in Canada to-day, and that whatever of good will we can engender in its stead will by so much lessen and lighten the magnitude and weight

of the problems which confront us. As Liberals we can have but one attitude towards prejudice whenever it raises its vicious head, and that is to strike it hard, strike it, if that be possible, to the death. We must resolve as never before to permit no new cleavage to destroy our national unity.

Is the splendid unity of our great country to be imperilled by a conflict of policies related primarily to geographical areas or particular interests, or are we to carry into the shaping of our national policies the same noble spirit of some sacrifice on the part of each, and willing co-operation on the part of all, by which alone the war was won? Shall it be each for self, or all for all? Shall it be the special interest of a class, or the well-being of the whole community? Shall it be Canada first as it was with the men who gave their lives with thought of naught save the honour of their country, and their duty before God? If it is this larger, this nobler ideal, we must have in our Federal politics some political party large enough, broad enough, tolerant enough, fearless enough, to carry forward such a policy of national unity. It must be a party representative of all the interests of the nation and reflecting in its composition the many-sided elements of our national life.

Parties are necessary, useful and likely to endure. To what better party can those of Liberal views look for a fulfilment of their desires than to a party that is Liberal in name as well as in aim, and which has a century of Liberal traditions to hold it through to the highest principles, and spur it on to yet nobler achievement.

With the liberal forces at work in Canada to-day among the farmers in the rural communities, among laborers in the cities and towns, among the returned soldiers, and among that great body of Canadian citizenry, men and women alike, who, apart from class affiliations or associations, are thinking and praying and striving for the dawn of that better day which the sacrifices and war were to usher in, there is nothing to withstay ultimate and speedy victory in the triumph of liberal ideals and policies, except a failure on the part of those who are opposed to a common enemy to co-operate in a spirit that has regard primarily for the good of all.

ARTHUR S. MEIGHEN

ARTHUR S. MEIGHEN

ARTHUR MEIGHEN was born on June 16th, 1874, on an Ontario farm. His grandfather, an Irishman, came to Canada in the early forties, taught school, and then settled on the farm where his son, Joseph, and his grandson, Arthur, were born. At school, Arthur showed remarkable ability as a scholar, but was of a deeply serious nature and took no part in sports. In 1896 he graduated in mathematics from the University of Toronto, and went to Winnipeg where he studied law and taught school. In 1903 he was called to the Bar and built up a successful practice at Portage-la-Prairie.

Mr. Meighen was elected to the House of Commons in 1909 and made his first speeches as a Conservative when the fortunes of his party were at a low ebb. His power of presenting facts clearly and logically, his faculty for sizing up a situation, and his love of hard work, caused his promotion to be rapid. He was appointed Solicitor-General in 1913, Secretary of State and Minister of Mines in 1917, and Minister of the Interior in October of the same year. He was responsible for the War Times Election Act, and drafted the bill for compulsory military service.

When, in 1920, Sir Robert Borden retired from the Premiership, Mr. Meighen was chosen in his stead. But he was not given a fair opportunity to demon-

strate his capacity for high statesmanship, because, in the election of December, 1921, his party was defeated, and he found himself in opposition. As leader of the critics of the present government, he watches the new party at the helm with characteristic vigilance, and, with staunch loyalty, upholds the interests of the Conservative Party.

Throughout his years of political service, Mr. Meighen has won a reputation for honesty, courage and a love of thoroughness which necessitates constant and patient toil. He has a finely-balanced legal mind, and is recognized as one of the most logical debaters in the Dominion Parliament. Normally, he is not a great orator, but on rare occasions he has risen to heights of eloquence which rival the performances of the masters.

THE GLORIOUS DEAD

Hon. Arthur Meighen

From an address at Thelus Military Cemetery, Vimy Ridge, July 3, 1921

THE Great War is past; the war that tried through and through every quality and mystery of the human mind and the might of human spirit; the war that closed, we hope for ever, the long, ghastly story of the arbitrament of men's differences by force; the last clash and crash of earth's millions is over now. There can be heard only sporadic conflicts, the moan of prostrate nations, the cries of the bereaved and desolate, the struggling of exhausted peoples to rise and stand and move onward. We live among the ruins and the echoes of Armageddon. Its shadow is receding slowly backward into history.

At this time the proper occupation of the living is, first, to honour our heroic dead; next, to repair the havoc, human and material, that surrounds us; and, lastly, to learn aright and apply with courage the lessons of the war.

Here in the heart of Europe we meet to unveil a memorial to our country's dead. In earth which has resounded to the drums and tramplings of many conquests, they rest in the quiet of God's acre with the brave of all the world. At death they sheathed in their hearts the sword of devotion, and now from oft-stricken fields they hold aloft its cross of sacrifice, mutely beckoning those who would share their immortality. No words can add to their fame, nor so long as gratitude holds a place in men's hearts can

our forgetfulness be suffered to detract from their renown. For as the war dwarfed by its magnitude all contests of the past, so the wonder of human resource, the splendour of human heroism, reached a height never witnessed before.

Ours we thought prosaic days, when the great causes of earlier times had lost their inspiration, leaving for attainment those things which demand only the petty passing inconveniences of the hour. And yet the nobility of manhood had but to hear again the summons of duty and honor to make response which shook the world. Danger to the treasury of common things—for common things when challenged are the most sacred of all,—danger to these things ever stirred our fathers to action, and it has not lost its appeal to their sons.

France lives and France is free, and Canada is nobler for her sacrifice to help free France to live. In many hundreds of plots throughout these hills and valleys, all the way from Flanders to Picardy, lie fifty thousand of our dead. Their resting places have been dedicated to their memory forever by the kindly grateful heart of France, and will be tended and cared for by us in the measure of the love we bear them. Above them are being planted the maples of Canada, in the thought that her sons will rest the better in the shade of trees they knew so well in life. Across the leagues of the Atlantic the heart-strings of our Canadian nation will reach through all time to these graves in France; we shall never let pass away the spirit bequeathed to us by those who fell; "Their name liveth for evermore."

ROBERT LAIRD BORDEN

ROBERT LAIRD BORDEN

1854-

THE little village of Grand Pre in the centre of one of Canada's most historic districts seemed a fitting birthplace for a future premier of Canada; and from the fact that his ancestors, staunch men of Britain, were United Empire Loyalists, one could almost predict his policy in the affairs of his country.

Robert Laird Borden was born on July 26, 1854, and spent his boyhood and early manhood in the historic country of Evangeline. He attended Acadia Villa Academy, a private school near his home, then after a year or two as a teacher, he began the study of law in Kentville under Sir R. L. Weatherbe and Mr. Justice Graham. In his profession he proved eminently successful and was admitted to the Bar in 1876. He practised first at Kentville in partnership with the present Judge Chipman, and later at Halifax, where his legal ability coupled with unremitting industry, made him one of the leaders of the Bar in his province.

Borden's political career began in 1898, when he was elected to the Canadian House of Commons, as a Conservative member for Halifax County. But he did not crave public life; his heart was in his profession, and for the first term he took little part in parliamentary affairs. His early speeches in Parlia-

ment were concerned with legal matters. In 1901, however, a crisis occurred in his life when, upon the resignation of Sir Charles Tupper, Borden was asked to assume the leadership of the Conservative Party. It was a difficult situation for a young man with little experience. To step into the shoes of parliamentary veterans like Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper, at such an awkward stage in the fortunes of the Conservative Party, might terrify a much older man. Moreover, his opponent, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was then at the zenith of his popularity. But Borden reluctantly accepted the task, and without the natural advantages of outstanding brilliancy, eloquence or charm which his rival possessed, piloted his party slowly, but surely, into safe waters.

His political beliefs were very conservative, and he opposed especially any policy which he felt would weaken the tie between Canada and the mother country. His opposition to the Reciprocity Bill, proposed by the Government in 1911, to facilitate trade relations between Canada and the United States, was the natural outcome of his political convictions. The question was decided in a general election that year, the Government was defeated, and Borden became Premier of Canada in October, 1911.

The nine years of Borden's premiership were years of arduous and faithful service to his country. He soon revealed unexpected qualities of leadership and while he lacked the brilliancy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, his personal integrity and strong British qualities inspired confidence in him as a man able to guide the destinies of Canada.

During the war years 1914-1918 Canada took her place as an equal among the great nations of the world, and the name of Borden will always be associated with the annals of his country during the period of her most heroic history. His efforts on behalf of the war were most untiring both at home and in Great Britain where he took part in the Imperial war conferences in 1917 and in 1918. When the end of the conflict finally came he went to Paris in 1919 as Canada's representative at the Peace Conference.

In the following year, 1920, ill-health compelled Borden to retire from the premiership. General regret was felt, but after a well-earned holiday he was able to act as Canada's representative at the Conference for the disarmament of nations at Washington in 1921.

Many honours have been showered upon Robert Borden since his entrance into public life. Honorary degrees have been conferred upon him by both British and Canadian universities, and in 1914 he was knighted by the King. His best reward, however, is the respect and esteem of the people of Canada.

FROM CONFEDERATION TO THE WORLD WAR

SIR ROBERT BORDEN

From a Speech delivered in 1921

THE Canadian people accomplished Confederation by means of a statute enacted at their instance by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Necessary amendments have been effected by subsequent Acts passed by that Parliament upon joint resolution of the Senate and Commons of Canada, and no such amendment has been refused. Thus the legal powers of the Parliament of the United Kingdom have been utilized as a convenient means of effecting constitutional amendments. Doubtless the Canadian Parliament would hesitate to pass any such resolution if its effect could properly be regarded as a violation of the original compact between the Provinces. In any such case it would be proper, and, indeed, necessary, to obtain the consent of every Province affected by the proposed amendment.

With the material growth and constitutional development of the overseas nations the Parliament of the United Kingdom has ceased to be an Imperial Parliament in any real sense so far as the Dominions are concerned. Its legal power is subject to the limitations of constitutional right. Theoretically it has power to impose direct taxation or compulsory military service upon the people of any Dominion; constitutionally and practically it possesses no such right or authority. The exercise of any power contrary to established or developing conventions would have legal sanction, but would not be respected, and

in the end could not be enforced. In practice the position is becoming tolerably clear; in theory there remains a singular anomaly. Apprehensions may be quieted if we remember that under our system of government many such anomalies may be observed. The King's veto is legally existent but constitutionally dead. Effective administration of public affairs would be impossible if any instrument of government should continually exercise its legal powers to the legal limit.

In the half century which elapsed between Confederation and the World War, constitutional development was notable both in character and extent. At the beginning the Governor General in his quality of Imperial officer exercised no inconsiderable influence over certain public affairs; at the close his functions in that character had practically ceased. Appointed with the consent of the Canadian Government, he had become in effect a nominated President, invested with practically the same powers and duties in this country as those appertaining to the King in the British Isles. New and convenient methods of consultation had been established through periodical conferences, in which at first the Dominions were regarded as subordinate dependencies attached to a department of the British Government, but in which they eventually took their places as sister nations upon equal terms with the United Kingdom. The Dominions were originally included in commercial treaties without much regard for their wishes or interests. Eventually no such treaty bound them except by the expressed consent of their Governments. At first Canada was told somewhat brusquely that

no Canadian commissioner could take part in the negotiation of a treaty affecting his country; in the end Canada freely negotiated her own commercial treaties by her own commissioners, without control, or interference except of a formal character. Canadians acting as British agents represented the interests of Canada and the whole Empire in the Behring Seas and Alaskan Boundary arbitrations. Naturalization granted in Canada became effective in the United Kingdom. Notwithstanding unfortunate and formidable forces of reaction, the right of the Dominion to full control of its copyright laws was acknowledged. It was gradually realized that legal power is over-ridden by constitutional right. The power to disallow Canadian statutes fell into desuetude. Canada's right to a voice in foreign policy involving her interests as a great Dominion of the Empire, began to be recognized. Her complete control over her policy in respect of military and naval defence was acknowledged. By these sure steps, Canada was steadily mounting to the stately portal of nationhood.

Thus stood the relations of Canada to the Empire in the fateful month of August, 1914. There had arisen a truer comprehension of the ties uniting the overseas nations and the motherland. At last it began to be realized that upon complete liberty and full autonomy a unity and strength capable of resisting the severest shock could be established. When the day of trial came, the response of the Dominions vindicated forever the principle that they had consistently upheld.

NEWTON W. ROWELL

NEWTON W. ROWELL

1867-

HON. N. W. ROWELL has climbed to a high place in his country's regard through sheer ability and indefatigable toil, and in his case ambition has gone hand in hand with conscience.

He was born on a farm in Middlesex County in 1867, and attended the local public school, after which he entered a dry goods warehouse in London. But he had other plans for his future, and spent his evenings in preparation for a wider sphere in life. Unaided, he obtained his matriculation, and began the study of law, graduating with high honours. In 1891 he was called to the Bar, and he has since achieved a wide reputation in the legal profession.

In 1911 Mr. Rowell was asked to assume the leadership of the Liberal Party in the Ontario Legislature though he was without previous parliamentary experience. During the six years that he held this position, he devoted himself to the improvement of social conditions in his province. His name is associated with the Temperance movement in particular, for in 1914 he appealed to the electors on the issue of "Abolish the Bar," and though defeated, it was the impetus that he gave to the Government which resulted in the adoption of the Ontario Temperance Act in 1916.

In 1917 he resigned the leadership of the Provincial Opposition, to join the Federal Unionist Government in formation. He was reluctant to break with his former chief, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, but patriotic zeal overcame his personal scruples, and he threw himself wholeheartedly into the task of "winning the war."

As a colleague of Sir Robert Borden, he became a member of the Imperial War Cabinet, Sir Robert and he acting as Canada's representatives in the Imperial War Cabinet, 1918. During Sir Robert's prolongued absence in Europe, Mr. Rowell was Acting Secretary of State in External Affairs, and in this capacity displayed the keenness of his intellect and the strength of his patriotism. For years he had been an enthusiastic advocate of international co-operation, and henceforth used his great intellectual and oratorical gifts in effecting a better understanding between Canada and the Empire. He still found time for social legislation, however, and in 1919 organized and administered a Department of Health, and obtained a more stringent control of the Drug Traffic.

In London and Paris, Sir Robert Borden was fighting to have Canada represented at the Peace Conference, and in the League of Nations, and to have the new status of the Dominions recognized by the other nations of the world. The struggle was intensified by the fact that the Imperial Government feared a departure from the traditional methods of diplomacy at such a crisis. At home in Canada, Mr. Rowell supported Sir Robert with his entire strength, and voiced the sentiments of the country

as a whole. When the Imperial Government became convinced of the fairness of Canada's contention, which was supported by the other Dominions, they gave Sir Robert's proposal whole-hearted support at the Peace Conference. The united efforts of Sir Robert and Mr. Rowell—with the Imperial Government for backing—succeeded in establishing the precedent. Henceforth Canada was to be recognized as a distinct nation—one of the groups of nations forming the British Commonwealth.

Mr. Rowell was chosen to represent Canada at the first assembly of the League of Nations held at Geneva in 1920. His diplomatic talents were readily recognized and he succeeded in raising the status of his country in the esteem of the other delegates. In his address he pleaded for a World League rather than a European one, and presented the North American view with clarity and vigour.

He retired from the Unionist Cabinet at the time of Sir Robert Borden's resignation and later withdrew from active public life. But with his great vitality and his magnificent dowry of public spirit, it is safe to prophesy that his service to Canada has not yet ended.

The complete significance of Mr. Rowell's service to Canada may not be realized for some time to come, for, owing to post-war conditions, she has yet to reap the full benefit accruing from her new position among the nations of the world. But he has already won the lasting gratitude of his countrymen for his share in obtaining for Canada a voice in international affairs.

CANADA'S PLACE IN THE EMPIRE

HON. N. W. ROWELL

From one of his addresses in connection with the Burwash Memorial Lectureship at the University of Toronto, 1922

WHAT contribution has Canada made to the unity, the strength, and the stability of the Empire in the past?

Her first and perhaps greatest contribution was the successful working out of the problem of responsible self-government. Every one recognizes at this time how impossible it would have been to preserve the unity of the British Empire if the policy of attempting to govern the Overseas Colonies from Downing Street had been persisted in; and yet, when the agitation for Responsible Government in Canada was at its height, the view of responsible statesmen in the Motherland was that the granting of Responsible Government was entirely incompatible with the maintenance of Imperial connexion.

Lord Stanley, the Colonial Secretary in the Conservative Government of Great Britain in the year 1844, in what was known in Canada as the "Great Debate," stated that to place the Governor in a state of dependence upon his Council and Parliament was "a course which by no gradual steps but certainly and at once would place the whole authority in the hands of the dominant party for the time, and convert Canada into a republic, independent of the Crown of this country. It was inconsistent with monarchical government that the Governor who was responsible should be stripped of all authority

and all power, and should be reduced to that degree of political power which was vested in the constitutional sovereign of the country. Not only would such a course be inconsistent with monarchical government, but also with the colonial dependence."

Lord Stanley concluded his address as follows: "I believe when they seriously consider the results of the alternative I have put they will follow, not the advice of the unprincipled demagogues—bad, rash and interested counsellors—but take as their guide the liberal, sound and honest views of the Governor-General."

Baldwin and LaFontaine were the political leaders in Canada who were fighting the battle of Responsible Government, and Joseph Howe was fighting a similar battle in Nova Scotia. Lord Durham's report on political conditions in Canada, made in 1839, which is one of the most notable State documents in British Colonial history, had approved the principle for which Baldwin, LaFontaine and Howe were contending, but the British Government of the day did not agree with Lord Durham.

Lord Elgin was appointed Governor-General of Canada in 1847. He at once recognized the justice of the claim for Responsible Government and with the full approval of the British Ministry, which had in the meantime changed, he accepted and applied the principle. A new government was formed in 1848 by Baldwin and LaFontaine, who possessed the confidence of Parliament and of the country, and the great battle for Responsible Government was won.

Contrast the statement of Lord Stanley in 1844 with the statement made seventy years later by another British statesman, Sir Herbert Samuel, who, speaking before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, said: "Two great discoveries in the sphere of government have been made by the British people, discoveries which have moulded the shape of the modern world. The first was the principle of representation, which alone enabled order to be reconciled with liberty, and the other was Colonial self-government, which alone had enabled autonomy to be reconciled with unity."

Colonial self-government, one of the two great discoveries in the sphere of government made by the British people, was contended for and secured by the people of Canada, not because they desired separation from the Motherland, but because they believed self-government essential to the satisfactory management of their own affairs, and that with peace and contentment within Canada the ties that bound her to the Motherland would be strengthened rather than weakened. Events have justified their view, and this great principle of colonial self-government, thus established first in Canada, was subsequently successfully applied to all the Colonies of the Empire settled with European stock. It was the general recognition and adoption of this principle which has made possible the continued unity and strength of the Empire.

The second contribution of Canada was Canadian Confederation. Canada was the first country to apply the principles of Parliamentary Government

to a Federation. By the union first of the four Provinces and later of the whole of Canada under one central Federal Government, Canada not only laid the foundations of a strong, prosperous and united British nation on this half of the North American Continent, but by her successful experiment she made possible a similar union of the Australian Colonies and later still a union of the South African Colonies. To-day the scattered Colonies of Canada, Australia and South Africa are three great self-governing Dominions within the British Empire.

At the time Confederation was proposed by Canada to the statesmen of Great Britain it was not looked upon by them as a step that would strengthen the Empire, but as one that would lead naturally and inevitably toward the separation of Canada from the Mother Country and the organization of an independent State. It was the desire of the late Sir John Macdonald that the new Confederation should be called the Kingdom of Canada, but the name was not favored by the British Government as it was thought it might offend the sensibilities of the people of the United States. The official trend of thought about the time of Confederation is well illustrated by the following extract from a letter of Lord Lyons, British Ambassador to Paris, to Lord Clarendon, British Foreign Secretary. Lord Clarendon had written asking his advice on some question concerning Canada, as he had been British Ambassador to Washington for many years. After discussing the political conditions in Canada, Lord Lyons expressed the opinion that the great problem for Great Britain

in American politics was to find some fair and honourable way of dissolving all connexion between England and her North American Colonies. He concludes: "In fact, it seems to be in the nature of things that the United States' prestige should grow and ours should wane in North America and I wish we were well and creditably out of the scrape . . ." Lord Clarendon on his side was equally emphatic. "I agree," he wrote, "in every word you say about our position in North America and wish they would propose to be independent and to annex themselves. We can't throw them off and it is very desirable that we should part as friends."

It is clear that Canada was not the spoiled child of an over-indulgent mother.

Here again the statesmen of the Mother Country were mistaken in their view, and history has shown that, with the larger powers and the greater freedom of action which have come to the people of Canada through the Canadian Confederation, the ties that have bound Canada to the Motherland have been strengthened rather than weakened; and this also applied to the other self-governing Dominions.

The statesmen of Canada were the first to recognize that the strength and unity of the Empire could only be maintained by the recognition of the full equality of status of the Dominions with the Mother Country in the British family of nations.

This request for an equal status was supported by the representatives of the other Dominions, and when frankly presented to the statesmen of Great Britain was accepted by them as a necessary and

logical constitutional development. This change in status has not been a sudden development, but a gradual growth, and the visible evidences of the change have been shown in the further recognition from time to time accorded to the Dominions in the Imperial family, rather than by specific acts which have changed the status.

The British Government has fully recognized in principle the equality of status of the Dominions with the Mother Country, and to-day the true definition of our constitutional relationship is that the members of the Britannic Commonwealth are a group or League of free, self-governing nations and India, united under a common Sovereign, bound together by ties of sympathy, of interest, and of common ideals, and preserving the strength and the unity of the whole through consultation and co-operation in all matters of common concern.

Do we appreciate all our citizenship means to us? We are full Canadian citizens, but we are much more than Canadian citizens—we are citizens of the whole Empire. A Canadian may travel in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australasia, and still be a citizen—not a foreigner. We are the possessors of a great inheritance. Our task is to improve it, to endeavour to realize its ideals, and to transmit those ideals to those who come after us.


Sir Wilfrid Laurier
George Brown
D'Arcy Mc Gee
C.W. Jefferys


Sir John
A. Macdonald
Joseph Howe
NOS LOIS
ET NOS
LANGUE
Louis J.
Papineau